

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages detached / pages détachées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transarence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents | <input type="checkbox"/> | Includes supplementary materials
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips,
tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the
best possible image / Les pages totalement ou
partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata,
une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de
façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Opposing pages with varying colouration or
discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best
possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des
colorations variables ou des décolorations sont
filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image
possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été filmées. | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires: | | |

Various pagings.

Appendix No. 1, No. 2 & No. 5 were not printed.

- In Appendix 2B, page 35 is incorrectly numbered page 53.

Appendix No. 3 was printed for distribution only.

Appendix No. 4 starts at p. 5.

APPENDIX

TO THE

TWENTY-THIRD VOLUME

OF THE

JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, DOMINION OF CANADA.

FROM THE 31ST JANUARY, 1889, TO THE 2ND MAY, 1889, BOTH DAYS INCLUSIVE.

Being the Third Session of the Sixth Parliament of Canada.

Session 1889.



OTTAWA:

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

1889.

VOLUME XXIII.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF APPENDICES, 1889.

- No. 1.—REPORT of the Select Committee appointed to examine into Combinations said to exist with reference to the purchase and sale or manufacture and sale in Canada of any foreign or Canadian products. *Not printed.*
- No. 2.—FIRST REPORT of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, General Immigration expenses rendered by Mr. W. A. Webster. *Not printed.*
- No. 2a.—SECOND REPORT of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, General Immigration expenses rendered by Mr. Henry Smyth. *Printed.*
- No. 2b.—THIRD REPORT of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Expenditure for Clothing, Militia and Defence. *Printed.*
- No. 3.—SIXTH REPORT of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. Evidence in relation to an Act for the relief of William Gordon Lowry. *Printed for Distribution only.*
- No. 4.—REPORT of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. *Printed.*
- No. 5.—REPORT of the Joint Committee in respect of Legislation. *Not printed.*

REPORT.

COMMITTEE ROOM, 15th April, 1889.

The Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts beg leave to present the following as their second report :—

Your Committee have had under consideration the accounts for general immigration expenses rendered by Mr. Henry Smyth, and set forth on page C—157 of the Auditor General's report for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1888; and for the information of the House submit herewith the evidence taken, and the papers laid before them, in connection with the said accounts.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. C. RYKERT, *Chairman.*

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 2nd April, 1889.

Committee met; Mr. Rykert in the chair.

HENRY SMYTH, of Chatham, Ont., called and examined :

By Mr. Somerville :

1. I understand that you were appointed an agent by the Immigration Department some time during 1887? 1887?
2. Yes; 1887. At what time were you appointed? 'I really quite forget. At this stage Mr. Taylor asked for the exclusion of Mr. Campbell, M.P., who was to be called.
3. Do you remember the date of your appointment? I do not.
4. Have you any memorandum or means of ascertaining when you were appointed? I might at home; but I have not here.
5. Have you none in your possession? None.
6. I understand from this memorandum that you were appointed on the 1st of May at \$100 per month and \$2 per day living allowance and actual travelling expenses? Yes; 1887.
7. When did you commence the discharge of the duties of the office? Immediately after getting the appointment.
8. I see by this account that your first charge is made on the 11th of June? That is not correct.
9. Did you render an account with dates prior to that? I rendered an account, but I do not know whether the dates were copied into the account or not; but I rendered for my work in the county of Essex.
10. When did you commence there? Immediately on getting the appointment.
11. I see you have charged a number of items for work done in Essex again in June? I think there was an account prior to that, which account was dated.
12. I asked for all the accounts and the Auditor General returned these.
THE AUDITOR GENERAL.—I returned all the accounts connected with that year.
- MR. SOMERVILLE.—May would be in that year.
- THE AUDITOR GENERAL.—No; May, 1887, would be in the fiscal year 1886.
13. I see you had expenses in the county of Essex. What were you doing in the county of Essex? I was circulating immigration literature. I followed an

agent, I think his name was Seuter, who was an agent for some American railways, in Essex. I found he was going everywhere and certain parties were about leaving and I notified Mr. Lowe and the Minister of Agriculture to have literature sent to them to counteract as far as possible the literature placed in their hands by the American agent.

14. Did you make a report from time to time? From time to time on my work in Kent and Essex.

15. Did you make a report of your work elsewhere? Not outside of this county.

16. You were then working for the Department about 6½ months and did not report what you had done? I reported when I got through. I did not report from time to time.

17. You reported when you got through? Yes; and in the meantime I got from Mr. Lowe and the Department of the Interior, which must be found herein, a large amount of Canadian literature for distribution in the United States. I had it all piled up in Chatham and intended taking it with me, but afterward had it mailed to parties in the United States.

18. Afterward I see you bought a ticket and took a sleeper to St. Paul? I do not think that is correct. I think I went to St. Paul in June, and came back from St. Paul in June. That is when I bought the ticket which I charged to the Department. I came down here.

19. When do you say you went to St. Paul? Sometime in June.

20. What time? I really cannot tell you.

21. Have you no account? I kept this account in a diary and pass book which I gave to Mr. Mitchell.

22. Have you that diary? No.

23. Has Mr. Mitchell it? No; he has not got it and that is the reason I brought him here.

24. You went to St. Paul in June? I went there in June, as I remember I was telegraphed by Mr. Mitchell to come back in June.

25. What time in June? I have not the slightest idea.

26. You must have some idea. Was it the first week or last? I really cannot tell you without my book.

27. You have no idea whether you went on the 1st, 15th or last of June? I have not the slightest idea. I know I went there and was there four or five days, and was telegraphed for by Mr. Mitchell, and returned and went to Toronto and Ottawa.

28. How do you make sure it was in June, if you are not sure as to the dates? I am sure it was in June, from the fact of my having taken a sudden trip afterward.

29. What time did you come back from this trip? I came back within a week, I think. I was wired by Mr. Mitchell to come; that I was needed.

30. I see by this account that you took a sleeper to St. Paul and Minneapolis? I would say in relation to this account, that I never saw this account until it was shown to me by Mr. Rykert yesterday morning.

31. You rendered an account to the Department? It was written by Mr. Mitchell, the gentleman whom you spoke of as my confidential clerk, and it was mailed to Mr. Carling.

32. You gave him the dates? I gave him my diary and pass book with which to make up the account.

33. Mr. Mitchell is a reliable man? I always looked upon him as such.

34. He was your confidential clerk? He was at one time; but he has left me and has only been working for me at odd times.

35. You supposed he would make out the account in accordance with dates in the diary and memorandum book? I do not know that he could. The items were mixed and one running into the other and it was quite possible there might be no dates. I depended upon him getting the exact sums. I am satisfied he did not put in any sums I had not paid out.

36. You think he had no means of ascertaining the dates? He had some means if he could have read the figures. After I gave him my books I was away for some days. He drove up to my house one night and said it was impossible for him to get the dates. I said it was not of so much importance about the dates as that I did not exceed the five months I was employed and the amount I had spent. He had the account pencilled out without the dates.

37. What had he these blanks for? To get the amount exact so long as he did not overrun. He has got me there in one place on the 31st of September, and there is no 31st of September. He has got me in some place in the North-West in November, when it was published throughout the length and breadth of the land that I was in Chatham in court.

38. You do not know when you took this sleeper in June? I am sure I took it in June.

39. Well, then, you were at St. Paul according to this account on the 7th, and on the 8th you were at Brainard, and then you were at Crookstown; were you in these places? I was, sir, every one of them.

40. When, in June? No, I was not in those places in June.

41. You were in those places when you started on this trip? No; when I started the first time I came back. I was in St. Paul and Minneapolis on that occasion, and I was in some counties there, Sawyer and other counties.

42. How many days were you out on this trip? I really could not tell you now, sir.

43. Were you a week? I think I was a week in that direction.

44. Were you two weeks? No; no.

45. Well now, you mean to say that these dates are wrong? These dates are all wrong.

46. And the charges must be wrong, too? No; the charges are correct. I think the aggregate came within \$13 of the amount as I had it.

47. How can the charges be correct, when you were not there? I was there.

48. At another time? At some time.

49. What time? I really could not tell you, sir.

50. You cannot tell? No; I really could not tell you. I have not seen the account since 1887. I can tell you right now, that it was only yesterday morning I saw the account. I can tell you the route I took.

51. You can tell the time you spent on it? No; I cannot.

52. In reality, you cannot tell anything at all about this account? Yes I can. I can tell you I expended every dollar there.

53-54. You were in these places on the date specified? No sir. I cannot say that, because I was in court in Chatham on the 15th of November, and I indicted a man for perjury in that court on the 21st of November.

55. Take some of the places you mentioned in this account, you could not make a mistake like this: stopped with James Wrencher, an old Kent friend? Yes; in Bellevue, Idaho.

56. There was no expense then; consequently, I will ask you about the other man you stopped with, W. W. Lewis? In Cheyenne.

57. Are you aware of the date you stopped with him? No; I am not.

58. You don't know anything about the dates? This account took me completely by surprise when I found it commenced on the 31st July and ended on the 31st November. Had it not been for the information I got here I would not have been able to tell you anything about the dates.

59. You have been in business for a long time? Yes.

60. You are a man of business habits? Yes.

61. You know that accounts rendered for services should be rendered in proper form? They should be, certainly.

62. Is it not incumbent upon you to render an account to the Government in proper form as it is to a private individual? I say from the time I gave Mitchell instructions to send in that account I never saw it till I saw it in Mr. Bykert's hands yesterday morning.

63. You are responsible for the correctness of this account? Certainly.
64. You know that it is customary in rendering accounts to give proper dates? I would have done so if I had rendered it myself.
65. Did you not look over it after making it out? No, sir; I had implicit confidence in the man. When I looked at the amount I remember I made the statement to Mr. Mitchell that the amount was less according to my little book and he said yes, but this was correct.
66. Who forwarded it to the Department? I think Mitchell did.
67. Did you write a letter? I think, perhaps, I wrote the letter and gave it to him.
68. What was in the letter? I really cannot say.
69. I want that letter produced. Well, when you came back from that trip what did you do then? Which trip, sir?
70. The trip to St. Paul? I went to Kansas.
71. What time did you go to Kansas? I do not remember.
72. Did you go in June? No.
73. Did you go in July? No.
74. When did you go? I went in the fall.
75. What were you doing in the meantime? I was making that trip.
76. Which trip? To Crookstown.
77. As I understand you, you started for St. Paul in June? Yes; and I came back.
78. When did you start again? I really cannot tell you.
79. Where did you start for? I started for St. Paul again.
80. What time did you start? I really cannot tell you.
81. Was it in June? No; I cannot tell you.
82. Was it in July? I think it must have been about the 1st of July.
83. About the 1st of July? I would think so.
84. Well, how long did you remain away that time? That is when you made the extended trip? I was away quite a time. I cannot tell you.
85. How long? I cannot say.
86. A week? Yes, longer than that.
87. Were you away two weeks? Yes.
88. Were you away three weeks? Yes.
89. Were you away four weeks? Yes.
90. Were you away five weeks? Yes.
91. Were you away six weeks? Yes.
92. Were you away seven weeks? I really cannot say. I can give you the places I went to.
93. Well, I think it is unfortunate for you, Mr. Smyth, that you have not got that memorandum book? I think it is myself. I might say the reasons that induced Mr. Mitchell to come here. He is the gentleman whom the Committee put out of the room. I can say this that when I told him the case was coming before the Committee, and I wanted the books, he could not find them. I said: "if you cannot find the books, you must come." He was the secretary of the circuit of which Mr. Campbell is one of the largest holders of stock, and he went to Messrs. Cook & Babcock's office, where Mr. Mitchell was afterwards employed, and thought he would have no difficulty, he says, in laying his hands upon them at once. He went there, and being unable to find the books, I compelled him to come here with me.
94. You cannot give me any idea how long you were away when you went to St. Paul? On my second trip?
95. I want you to give me some idea. I think you are in duty bound to do this, to give me some idea? Five or six weeks I should say I was away, yes.
96. And you started about the first of July? Well, I think I did, yes.
97. Then as near as you can give it? I am very poor in recollecting dates.
98. You came back in six weeks? Yes; in about six weeks.
99. That would be about the 10th of August? I really cannot tell.

100. But it would if you stayed six weeks? I really cannot say that I stayed six weeks.

101. Did you stay a week? Yes.

102. Did you stay two weeks? More than three or four weeks; but I cannot tell the length of time I stayed.

103. It was at least four weeks? Yes.

104. What did you do then? Then I came home.

105. Then you came home? I do not know that I came home, I may have gone back in the same direction. I think I went to Kansas and went south and west.

106. Did you come back to Chatham at all? Yes; undoubtedly.

107. After this four or five weeks' trip? In the latter part of October.

108. And then went right off? No.

109. Did you come back after this second trip to St. Paul? Yes.

110. About what date? I really cannot tell you.

111. Would it be the 10th of August? I do not know.

112. Were you in Chatham then? I cannot say. I know I was not five weeks in Chatham during the whole year after the 26th of February. The 22nd of February was the date of the election. I do think I will state positively that I was not there six weeks continuously during the whole year.

113. How long do you think you were in Chatham after you came back that time? I do not recollect.

114. When did you next start out? I remember going to Kansas City and coming back from there and starting out on coming back to —

115. When you came back to Chatham that time, you do not know how long you stayed? No; I do not know.

116. Where did you start for then? I do not remember.

117. Did you go to New York? No; I never was in New York.

118. Did you go to Ohio? No.

119. Because Mr. Lowe said the last time he was here that you had a roaming commission all over the North American Continent. Where did you go to? I remember going to Kansas City and Omaha, and remember the route I took.

120. You went this third time; you started out from Chatham to Kansas City? Yes.

121. How long did you stay there? I do not recollect. I remember driving out to Independence and Leavenworth, Atcheson, Selina, Junction City and back to Kansas City and back to Omaha.

122. What work were you doing there? I was making enquiries of people who had settled in the United States from Canada, and was sending home instructions to Mr. Mitchell to send out circulars of our Canadian literature.

123. Where to? To these different points.

124. Why didn't you take them with you? That is what I intended doing when I started out, but it was too bulky and I did not want to pose as an agent of the Canadian Government, and perhaps if I had I would not have got the information that I otherwise got.

125. You have charges in several places in the account for a man; was it for distributing literature? No; if I hired a man as in Montana, to take me to a certain point, I had to pay him for the team and his expenses.

126. When you went away and came back in the middle of August, how long did you stay? I did not say it was the middle of August.

127. You say you were away six weeks, and was only in Chatham a few days and went away again? I was only in Chatham a few days when I started for Kansas City.

128. Well, if you were only in Chatham a few days, you must have started about the 10th of August? I went in the fall to Kansas City.

129. You must come back to the time when you made your third trip. You say you started from Chatham about the first of July, and you stayed away four, five or six weeks, you came back to Chatham, stayed a few days, and then you started for

Kansas City? I was longer away than four, five or six weeks, and I think I came back to Chatham and went back.

130. Were you longer away in the North-West than five or six weeks, if you started on the first of July? I don't think I was.

131. You say you were after you came back to Chatham? I do.

132. Do you know how long you stayed in Chatham? I do not.

133. Then you started for Kansas City? I did not start for Kansas City till October, in the fall.

134. What did you do in August when you came back? I do not think it was in August when I came back.

135. When was it you came back? I cannot tell you.

136. Was it in September? I cannot tell you.

137. Was it before or after August? I cannot remember the dates without my books.

138. Well you know that you did start for Kansas City? Yes.

139. Where did you start for? After you came back on this second trip, where did you start for then on the third trip? I cannot recall. I cannot recall if I did come back to Chatham so soon. I know I was back two or three times from my trip, and on my trip back I made no charges to the Government. I went back and took up the thread at the place just where I left it off.

140. I see you did charge. I see that you charged \$8 expenses while you were at home? I was not aware of that.

141. All I want to get at is as regards the truth of this account? I state that every dollar expended or charged here was expended properly.

142. I want to investigate these accounts and see how you incurred these expenses? I have no objection.

143. When did you start out again if you came back to Chatham in August? I cannot tell you.

144. You do not know? I cannot tell you.

145. Did you start out at all? Certainly I started out.

146. What time did you start? I cannot tell you.

147. Did you start out in August at all? I know I was out in August and in September and a portion of October and a small portion of November and a greater portion of December.

148. Where were you in August when you started? I cannot say.

149. Do you know? I think I was in the North-West.

150. Would this account be any indication of where you were? I really cannot say as to that, sir.

151. You cannot say? I cannot say as to the dates there.

152. What value do you put on them? I can swear I was in every town mentioned there I think.

153. When? I cannot tell you that.

154. You don't know when you were there? I cannot tell you that.

155. Well, it is very unsatisfactory, I think you must be gifted with a very poor memory? As to dates I am, there is no question about that, I know that well. Mr. Campbell told me yesterday; I did not know when the Clancy protested election trial came off.

156. Well, no w, certainly in an account of this magnitude, amounting to considerably over \$1,000, we ought to have some information? So you ought, there is no question about that. If I had supposed the account was not correct as to dates, I would have endeavored to supply myself with the dates.

157. Was it not your duty to see? I think perhaps it was, but having been away so much, I don't believe I ever saw that account at all except to look at the totals, I may have given a letter to Mr. Carling to Mitchell to enclose.

158. What right had you to impose an account of this kind upon the Government if you did not know it was correct? When Mitchell came to my house that night I concluded that the account was correct. As long as this account is correct I did not think it would make any difference as to dates.

159. Did you not tell him to put in the dates? No; I told him to get it as nearly right as he could.

160. So you told him to put in the dates? No; I would not tell him in December to put in November when the whole world knew I was in Chatham. I had one of these diaries with three columns in the page and the pages would be filled up in pencil with the names of persons to whom pamphlets were to be sent, and with the names of places and expenditure, and one thing or another.

161. Well, now, you would fill up that diary at the proper dates when you were there? Yes; I remember in many cases I turned it sideways and wrote in the margin so as to get it filled in.

162. You were very anxious to get the dates correct? I did not suppose there ever would be a question as to the dates so long as my account did not exceed the actual amount expended.

163. You see there is the question—you say in making your memorandum you had a diary and you entered your expenses when they were incurred, and when you purchased a ticket you entered it at the proper date? The expenses was a later part of the arrangement. The places I was at and the names of those I saw and what I did, I endeavored to put in the first part, but the expense account I kept over. For a portion of the time I had a diary and a portion of the time I had a pass-book.

164. When you stopped at a hotel over night you did not put in the diary your expenses were so much? I put it in the back part of the book. I do not remember that I put any date.

165. The diary would indicate where you were? Not necessarily.

166. The diary could not be relied on? Why I ran three or four items into different dates. From one part I might start on Monday and run into Tuesday or Wednesday of that week by writing across it.

167. What is reliable about the whole affair? The amount I expended I swear is the true amount that I put in to the Department of Agriculture.

168. I have traced you now for two trips. When you started on this third trip you say you do not know when you started, but it was later than August? I cannot remember the dates at all.

169. And you do not know where you went to? I know I went to Kansas City in the latter part of October.

170. Can you tell us where you went to when you started out on the third trip? I can tell you the places I went to, but I cannot tell you the dates.

171. You must have some idea and the amount would impress it on your mind? I know I went away immediately after February, 1857, after my defeat in February, and was not in Chatham continuously for six weeks during that year.

172. You can give no information as to when you went, how long you stayed and when you came back? No; but I can give you information as to the amount.

173. How long did you stay? I can give you pretty nearly.

174. You can tell how long you stayed at each place? Yes.

175. That is rather singular. Your memory is defective in small matters? Can you tell when you came back after the third trip? No.

176. No idea? Not the slightest.

177. Not the slightest? Only that it was the year 1857, and that I expended every dollar that is there.

178. It seems to be a singular affair that a man discharging a public duty should be so careless about his accounts? There is just this much singularity about it. It is incorrect as regards the dates but not as regards the amount.

179. You came back to Chatham sometime in October I think. You had a ticket to Toronto I see. You were at Winnipeg on the 30th and 31st September. Would that be right? I really cannot tell.

180. Do you know if you were in Winnipeg at all in September? I cannot remember the month.

181. Can you not bring any incident to your recollection that would bring it to your mind? Yes; meeting Mr. Luxton, the newspaper man, and a friend there, who is a lawyer, and others.

182. Was it cold weather? No.
183. Fair, warm weather? Yes.
184. Very warm? I cannot recollect.
185. Would it be in August do you think? I have been in Winnipeg a great many times in my life.
186. Well you recollect starting from Winnipeg for Toronto do you in 1887? Yes, I remember.
187. By what route did you come? Canadian Pacific Railway, North Bay, I think, to Toronto that trip.
188. Will you remember about what date that was? I cannot.
189. I see it is put in the account that you left Winnipeg for Toronto on the 1st of October? I cannot recollect.
190. And you have expenses for three days and then on the 4th of October you arrive in Toronto and you take a ticket to Chatham. Do you remember being in Chatham on the 4th of October? I do not.
191. You stayed in Chatham from the fourth till the eighth? I think extra time.
192. You had expenses in Chatham, \$8, according to the account? I don't think I had any expenses in Chatham except that it was going into the country.
193. Did you go into the country? I cannot recall; I was continually moving —at work.
194. Well, it is singular indeed that at an early date like that you came back from the North-West to Chatham and you stayed four days. I should think it ought to be impressed upon your memory what you did? I think I was there on my business.
195. What were you giving attention to? On these particular dates?
- 195½. Yes? If my own business needed attention I was compelled to do it.
196. You remember being in Chatham about that date? No, I do not. I remember being in Chatham—I don't know the date.
197. You are not sure whether you were in Chatham or not at that time? I cannot recall the dates.
198. You really don't know whether you were in Chatham at all about that time? I know I was in Chatham about that time, I cannot recall the date.
199. Well, then, I see you started then for Kansas. Ticket for Kansas on the 9th of October. Do you remember anything about that? I remember going to Kansas City and coming back.
200. When did you go? I cannot recall. I only stayed in Chatham a few days.
201. Then you started for Kansas City? Then I started for Kansas City.
202. Can you give us some account of your trip after you went to Kansas City? I remember driving out to Independence with a former resident of Chatham. I remember going to Leavenworth.
203. Just look at the account, and tell where you went, any way? I can remember without it.
204. That will refresh your memory? I do not need to be.
205. I want to refresh it; it don't seem to be very good? It is good as to where I was.
206. Just state where you went? I went to Kansas City, Leavenworth, Atcherson, Topeka, Junction City, Salena, and then I came back to Kansas City.
207. What then? I came to Chatham on a telegram from Chatham.
208. What time did you go to Chatham? I cannot recollect.
209. How long did it take you to do this work? Seven or eight days, I think. It might be ten.
210. Were you at Omaha on that occasion? No; not on that occasion.
211. I see the account says you were in Omaha? No; not on that occasion. I came back to Chatham first.
212. Is the account wrong in that particular, when it says you were in Omaha? It is wrong as to the date, but not as to the fact. I was there.

213. You came back to Chatham ? A. Yes.
214. What time did you get back to Chatham ? I do not remember.
215. You started about the 9th of October ? From where ?
216. Chatham. You then went to Kansas City, and you say it took you how many days ? Seven or eight days.
217. How many days would it take you on the trip out ? About thirty hours from Chatham.
218. And thirty hours back ; that is sixty hours ? Yes ; I think it is a day and a night.
219. That would be about nine days ? Yes.
220. You were in Chatham about the 18th of October ? Or 20th.
221. How long were you in Chatham then ? Mr. Campbell says we went to church on Sunday.
222. Never mind what Mr. Campbell says. He can tell his own story ? I know I went to church and Mr. Campbell says it was on the 23rd of October.
223. I see you spent a great many Sundays in travelling ? Yes ; according to that I spent every day, Sunday and Monday. As a matter of fact when I was out I did travel on Sunday.
224. What time were you at church in Chatham ? Mr. Campbell says it was on the 23rd of October. It was the day the Roman Catholic church was opened. I know I was at the opening of that church and Mr. Campbell says it was on the 23rd of October.
225. What church was it ? The opening by Rev. Father Williams of his new church.
226. You are quite positive you were not in Kansas City ? I am quite positive. I know I was in church.
227. Why are you so positive about that and not positive about anything else ? I do not go to church very often and it was a great occasion the opening of a church, and Mr. Campbell fixes the date.
228. Can you remember where you went after that ? If my memory serves me I went away the very next day.
229. Where to ? To Omaha.
230. On the 24th ? Yes ; I am sure. I think so.
231. That would be in accordance with your account ? I do not know whether it would or not. I think I went to Omaha the next day and I was telegraphed the next day by Mr. Clancy, the local member against whom a protest was made, to come back.
232. How long did it take you to get to Omaha ? I do not know.
233. You know the distance. It is about the same as Kansas City ? It may be 24 hours, or perhaps 30 hours.
234. Did you start on the morning of the 24th ? What time do the trains leave Chatham connecting with the through trains for Omaha ? We have the Grand Trunk Railway trains.
235. Did you go by the G. T. R. ? I think I went on the Michigan Central.
236. What time does the Michigan Central train leave ? It leaves several miles out. The Michigan Central does not run to Chatham.
237. Can you remember the time of day you started in October, 1887 ? I am out on trips nearly every week of my life, and I might confound one trip with another. I can tell you the time the train leaves on the Erie and Huron to connect.
238. Did you leave on the Erie and Huron ? Yes ; I think I did.
239. What time did you leave ? I think it was two o'clock.
240. And you started for Omaha ? I started for Omaha.
241. How long did you stay in Omaha ? I cannot say.
242. A day ? Yes, two or three days.
243. Were you there a week ? No, I was telegraphed to come back almost immediately.
244. What do you call immediately ? Well, a day or two.

245. Were you there two days? I do not remember whether I was there two days at that time, I think I was. I think I was at the Paxton House two days.

246. That would be one day in going. It takes more than a day to go to Omaha. It is eight hours from Chicago? I think it is.

247. It would take two days? I am not sure.

248. It would take two days to go and two days to come? About that.

249. You are positive you were in Omaha two days? I cannot recollect. I think I was in Chatham in about a week, if not sooner, from the day I went till I came back.

250. Who telegraphed you to come back to Chatham? Mr. Clancy.

251. Did you do any work? I made enquiries and saw some people from Chatham.

252. Residents there. How many? Two or three.

253. In business? One man is a butcher.

254. Were you trying to coax him to get him into Manitoba? I was getting information as to the settlers about there and the people he knew from Canada.

255. Did you report the information which he gave you to the Government? I reported the information I got to Mitchell to send them pamphlets. Mitchell afterwards attended to it.

256. What was this butcher's name? Savage.

257. What information did Mr. Savage give you? I do not know except as to the men from Canada about what they were doing and how they were doing.

258. Do you know of any particular farmer referred to? I do not remember the names.

259. Was the information that Savage the butcher gave you of interest? Well, I thought it of interest. I thought it well to get the names of persons who were tenants who were dissatisfied and disaffected and get our literature into their hands instead of the literature of Nebraska which they were distributing in abundance. I think I did report something in reference to the large amount of literature being sent out from the State of Nebraska.

260. Who telegraphed you? After I was telegraphed to, Mitchell telegraphed to me that there were charges against me in connection with the controverted election trial and I had better go back.

261. Well, did you consider it right to charge the Government with that trip? I do not think I ever charged the Government with the amount I paid for that.

262. You charged your trip coming back? It was upon another occasion when I came back.

263. It was not upon that occasion? No, sir.

264. You charged going out. Did you not? I would charge one round trip to the Government.

265. Yes, well you came back to Chatham? I came back to Chatham.

266. What time? I think within a week from the time I started.

267. You started on the 24th? I think it was.

268. That would be on the first of November you were in Chatham? I think I was in Chatham on the 2nd of November. I think if Mr. Campbell is correct in reference to the date of his controverted election trial I was in Chatham on the 2nd of November.

269. Now, according to your account you purchased a ticket on the 2nd of November to Plum Creek? That is a mistake. My account has been run on. A break has not been made between my first trip between Chatham and Omaha. Mitchell has carried it on just as if I had not come back.

270. Don't you think it was careless of you to allow an account like that to be sent down here? I think it was.

271. You did not go to Plum Creek on the 2nd of November? Not on the 2nd of November, no, sir.

272. Well, you were charging as being at Plum Creek on the 2nd of November, when you were in Chatham? I only charge once as being at Plum Creek and I was there.

273. In what year? In 1887.

274. Sure? I am sure.

275. I see according to this account you were at the Miller House on the 3rd of November? Where is the Miller House?

276. That is what I would like to ask you. Can you tell us where the Miller House is; I am asking you that? At Plum Creek.

277. And you had a horse and buggy into the country? I had a dozen I think.

278. To go to the Canadian settlements? Yes.

279. Then on the 4th of November you went to Denver; took a sleeper on the W. P. What is the name of that road? It is the U. P.

280. What is that? The Union Pacific.

281. You paid \$20.50 for a ticket? Yes.

282. On the 5th of November you were at Jamesville? When I say the 5th, I have told you repeatedly that I do not stick to those dates.

283. How long did you stay in Chatham when you came back that time? I do not recollect.

284. Did you stay a month? No.

285. Did you stay a week? Yes.

286. Did you stay two days? Yes.

287. Did you stay two weeks? I know I was in Chatham on the 2nd of November, and I was in Chatham at the election trial on the 15th and 16th, Mr. Campbell tells me.

288. I do not care what Mr. Campbell says. I was in Chatham when Mr. Campbell was unseated, or when his election trial was being proceeded with, and I was in Chatham and gave evidence in the Clancy-Dillon election trial. I do not know what the dates were except you will allow me to tell you what Mr. Campbell gives me as the date. It was published all over Canada, the fact that I had indicted a man for perjury, and that I stayed there to prosecute him.

289. I suppose when you got the information that you were wanted here, you hunted up information? I supposed this account would give it just as it was.

290. You said a little while ago that your memory on dates was not to be relied on? I said it was to be approximately relied on as to dates.

291. If Mr. Mitchell made out your account from the diary, could you say it would be approximately correct? If he made out your account—you say he is a reliable man—according to your dates and figures in the memorandum book, the account as a matter of necessity must be approximately correct? I do not think he could have got it. I think I could have got it out from the hieroglyphics and inter-lineations.

292. Are you a shorthand writer? No, sir; but one day would run into another. Some names of pamphlets he might have thought was the name of some hotel or something else.

293. Then this memorandum which you gave to this man you think you could have made it out yourself? Yes.

294. Why didn't you make it out yourself? Because I was very busy, and this man had done this sort of thing for me since 1883.

295. What sort of thing? Putting dates in your accounts? No; writes letters or anything I want.

296. You gave evidence before the Court in an election trial in November —

Mr. TAYLOR. I submit that I have listened for some time to this, and I believe he is putting leading questions, and such as would not be permitted in any court. He says: "On a certain day you did so and so."

Mr. DAVIES. That is a matter for the judge.

The CHAIRMAN. I look upon this in the nature of a cross-examination.

297. I am not a lawyer, and do not profess to be a lawyer, and want to be within the rule. I do not think it is necessary to confine ourselves to the strict legal usage. We want to get at the evidence. You gave evidence in the Clancy election trial in Chatham? Yes; the Clancy-Dillon controverted election trial.

298. Now that you admit that, I do not think it necessary to produce the papers? What was the date?

299. It was on the 15th? Then, I do not want to see it.

300. I think, perhaps, you had better see it? I know that I saw the statement in the *Globe* and *Mail* and *Empire*: "Henry Smyth called and sworn as a witness."

301. Well, do you remember on the 16th November, Mr. Smyth, what you were doing then? Was not that court day?

302. No that was not court day. What were you doing on the 16th of November? I think we were there two days if I recollect it right. I am not sure, though. I think so.

303. On the 16th of November. Do you remember what you were doing on the 16th of November? No.

304. Did you not proceed against a man named William Thornton for perjury? I did and carried it through.

305. You swore out a warrant charging him with perjury? I did, sir, in that trial.

306. What day was that? I don't remember.

307. What month was it in? In the same month.

308. In November? Yes.

309. After the trial? Yes.

310. Well, say how many days after the trial? I think it was the same day or the next day.

311. Well, you swore out a warrant against this man Thornton for perjury? I did.

312. You gave evidence in the Police Court? I did.

313. This was on the 16th of November, the day after the election trial? I told you, sir. I think we had two days of the election trial.

314. It would be about the 15th or 16th? Yes.

315. Well, I see, according to your account, that you bought a ticket to Omaha from Boise City on the 14th and paid \$59 for it? I did not buy a ticket on the 14th.

316. According to your account you bought a ticket on the 14th at Boise City for Omaha for which you paid \$59, and you had sleepers \$9, and you started on the 14th of November? The date is incorrect.

317. Then you were at the Paxton House, Omaha, on the 17th of November? The date is not correct.

318. Then you were at Council Bluffs, Ogden House, on the 18th? The date is incorrect.

319. Cheyenne on the 19th? I was in Sioux City and Des Moines.

320. You bought a ticket on the 20th of November for Fort Dodge, for which you paid \$4? I was at Fort Dodge.

321. On the 21st you had expenses at the Arlington House, where is the Arlington House? At Des Moines, I think.

322. It did not take you very long getting back to Des Moines? I forget now.

323. You could not have got back to Des Moines? I forget now.

324. Your account shows at all events that you were out there when you were in Chatham giving evidence before the police court? The date is wrong, sir, but the amount is correct.

325. This is the information you swore out against this man Thornton? I admit the information.

326. Will it be necessary to read this and have it put in as evidence? I admit it. I swore out that information.

327. I want an affidavit put in—

THE CHAIRMAN—You have no right to put it in. That cannot be used, as a matter of fact, as evidence in this investigation. If you want to fix the date you should ask the witness if it is the proper date or not.

By Mr. Somerville:

328. Is that correct? I swore out an information in similar terms to that.

329. That is the information, is it? I cannot tell you.
330. What is the date of that information? 16th November, I swore out that information.
331. That is correct, the 16th of November? I think it was the 17th.
332. At Chatham? Yes.
- Hon. Mr. FOSTER—Is that a copy?
- MR. SOMERVILLE—It is a copy.
- By Mr. Somerville:*
333. Is that the evidence you gave at the Police Court? Read that over? I admit I was in Chatham, swore out the information and gave evidence at the Police Court.
334. Were you in the Police Court on the 16th of November? I was in the Police Court the night the man was arrested. He was remanded for a few days. I was there when he was sent for trial.
335. If I give you the dates, can you recollect? Yes.
336. It would be about the 21st November? I think this was the 17th.
337. Then that would be the date? I went back to Omaha.
338. Well, what time did you start for Omaha? I think immediately after.
339. How long did you stay at Omaha that trip? I went right through, I think. I went from Omaha to some place that is very familiar, but which I cannot recollect. I think then I went to Grand Island.
340. You started immediately after this investigation in the Police Court? Almost immediately.
341. Would it be the 23rd? I cannot say.
342. Would it be the 24th? I think it was.
343. It would be within the week. You started almost immediately after giving this evidence for Omaha again? Yes.
344. How long did you stay in Omaha then? I cannot recollect. I only passed through.
345. Where to? I think to Lincoln. Let me see the account and I can tell you then.
346. What did you do over there? I went to Freemont and Grand Island.
347. Which date were you looking at here (referring to the account)? I was looking at the date.
348. Grand Island. Then you think this might be correct. This the 3rd of October? No; certainly not when I was in Chatham on the 23rd of November.
349. Then you were at Grand Island in November? Yes.
350. About what time did you get to Grand Island? I am not sure whether it was November or the first of October.
351. How long were you in Grand Island? Where did you go from there? I think I went to Plum Creek.
352. How long did you stay in Plum Creek? I think a day.
353. Where did you go from there? Denver.
354. How long did it take you to get over to Denver from Plum Creek? I think a night, only a few hours.
355. That would be about the 4th of December? I cannot recollect it.
356. You say you were in Plum Creek about the 2nd? It might have been about the latter part of November.
357. How close to the latter part? It must have been very close, because I was in Chatham on the 21st of November.
358. Well, you were at Plum Creek at all events within a week after you left Chatham on the 22nd of November? I think so.
359. That would make it the 29th of November. You stayed until about the 2nd of December? You said that.
360. Where did you go? From Plum Creek to Denver.
361. That took you how long? I do not know.
362. I wish you would fix the date when you were in Plum Creek? I cannot.

363. You say it was either the 29th of November or the 2nd of December. You started for Plum Creek at all events? Yes; I was at Plum Creek.
364. You started from there for where? Denver.
365. How long were you there? I cannot recollect.
366. Did it take you a day? I think so.
367. How long did you stay at Denver? Just for a night.
368. Where did you go then? Cheyenne.
369. What distance is that? I think about a hundred miles.
370. A hundred miles? I think so.
371. That would take you another day? Four hours.
372. How long did you stay there? I stopped over night with W. W. Lewis.
373. That would be in the latter part of December? Or the latter part of November.
374. Then where did you go? When I went from there my objective point was Bellevue, Idaho.
375. How long did you stay there? I stayed one night with James Wrencher.
376. Where did you go from there? To Boise City.
377. How long were you there? Just half a day or a day.
378. From Boise City where did you go? I went back to Omaha.
379. How long did you take to get back to Omaha? I don't know.
380. Well, you must have some idea of the time? No, I have not. I think it was four or five hundred miles.
381. When you got to Omaha how long did you stay there? I crossed immediately to Council Bluffs.
382. How far is Council Bluffs away? Just across the river.
383. How long did you stay there? Half a day, and then I went to Sioux City.
384. Where did you go from Council Bluffs? Sioux City.
385. How long did you stay at Sioux City? Just a day.
386. When you left Sioux City where did you go? I think Fort Dodge.
387. How long were you at Fort Dodge? Just a day.
388. When you left Fort Dodge where did you go? Des Moines I think.
389. How long did you stay there? I am not sure whether I took a week there. I took a week at Oskaloosa and Fort Dodge.
390. After you left Des Moines where did you go? Oskaloosa.
391. Where is it? In what State is it? In Iowa.
392. How long did it take you to make that trip? A few hours.
393. How long did you stay at Oskaloosa? I took a rig and went into the country.
394. Did you spend a week in the country? Just a day.
395. You came back to Oskaloosa? No, I went to Cedar Rapids.
396. How long did you stay in Cedar Rapids? A very little time.
397. A day? I don't think I did.
398. Where did you go from Cedar Rapids? Chicago.
399. How long did you stay in Chicago? I think just about time enough to get two meals. I took the first train out.
400. Where did you go? To Chatham.
401. What time did you get back to Chatham? Sometime in December.
402. What time in December? The latter part of December.
403. Give us some time? I cannot tell you. I think it was only a few days before Christmas.
404. Give us the date? I think the 23rd or 24th of December I came back.
405. You are positive about that—are you? I think that is the case.
406. Would you be willing to swear that is the case? I think I would.
407. That you got back to Chatham about the 24th of December? The 23rd I think. I would think so. Yes.
408. Well, what did you do then, Mr. Smyth? I went home and ate my Christmas dinner.

409. Your time was up? My time was more than up, I believe a month more than what I was engaged for.

410. This was in December. Your time would run out in November—about the first of November. You put in a month and a-half of extra time. You claimed a month and a-half of extra pay? I claimed a half a month's extra pay.

411. I think you claimed more than that, Mr. Smyth, one month's extra travelling expenses and a half a month's salary? Whose statement is that?

412. It is just as I get it here, I don't know whose it is? From the Department I suppose.

413. I suppose? I think it would be half a month.

414. You got back at all events about the Christmas days? Yes.

415. You were not in Chatham from the time you left in November, after the Police Court investigation there with regard to perjury in the case of Thornton, until you came back at Christmas? Not after I took that last trip until Christmas:

416. You were not in Chatham nor in Canada? No.

417. Do you remember the petition that was got up in Chatham to extend the limits in the summer of 1887? I remember the petitions.

418. Who signed it? I think a gentleman by the name of John Bedford came to me and I signed it.

419. Do you remember what time that petition was presented to the Town Council? No, I do not.

420. Do you know that it was signed only a few days before it was presented? I do not think it was. I think I saw it in the hands of that man long before. I know I have signed two or three petitions in connection with the same business.

421. Do you remember the Creek Bank being piled in 1887? I do not recollect that it was done in 1887. I know some piling was done.

422. Was it in 1886? I know I had it done. I know I brought the attention of the Government to the matter.

423. You ought to be able to fix a year for that? I was elected in 1882, and defeated in 1887. It was done in my time but I cannot recollect the year.

424. Was it done in 1887? I really cannot say.

425. If some reliable man would come here and say it was done in 1887, and that you were there, would you believe him? Not if I was away.

426. But you are not certain that you were away? I would have to be certain about that.

427. Do you remember about a street opening in Chatham. Do you remember that an attempt was made in 1837 to open Foster and Patrick Streets in Chatham? I do not know that it was in 1887.

428. Do you know a woman named Street there? Very well indeed.

429. You took an interest in the matter? Yes.

430. Is she a Mrs. or a Miss? I took an interest in the matter, for I have known her husband for the last twenty years.

431. Do you remember that you took an interest in the matter and was making representations on her behalf in 1887 about that matter? No, I do not.

Mr. TAYLOR—What has this matter to do with the question?

432. Do you know a man named Gowan? Gowan? Yes. I know him.

433. Did you represent Mrs. Street? No.

434. Were you not acting for her? I suppose I spoke to someone about her.

435. Do you remember going to someone in the town and speaking for her? I was interested in this way: She came to my house and asked me to get compensation. I advised her to get a lawyer.

436. Do you not remember meeting Mr. Malcolmson and Mr. Gowan? No.

437. If Mr. Gowan came here and swore that you spoke to him about it, would you believe him? Yes.

438. Did you meet him scores of times about this? No.

439. If he swears that you came to him about titles many times would you believe him? He is not a man who knows much about titles.

440. If he came here and swore that you were there investigating this matter with him, would you believe him? I would not doubt him.

441. You think he would swear the truth? I think he would.

442. Do you know a man named Hugh Mapleson? Yes.

443. What position does he occupy? He is the mayor of the town.

444. He is a respectable man? He is.

445. You would believe him on his oath? Yes.

446. Do you know S. T. Martin? Very well, indeed.

447. What did Martin have to do with the street opening? He acted for the town.

448. He acted for the town? When you speak of Gohan, I think he was acting for the town.

449. According to your account, Martin acted for the town? Yes.

450. And you had consultations with Mr. Malcolmson and Martin about this matter? I think we met Malcolmson and spoke to him about it.

451. You had consultations with him? I don't think I had any consultations with him.

452. Now, do you know a man named George Gordon Martin? Well, I do.

453. What is he? I think he was admitted to practice law about six months ago in Toronto.

454. What kind of a man is he? He is a very fine little man.

455. Is he a respectable man?

Mr. HESSON.—I object. What has this to do with it?

By Mr. Somerville :—

456. Mr. Smyth, Mr. Gordon is a reliable man is he? You would believe him on oath? I would in certain cases.

457. Would you believe him in any case? Not in all cases.

458. What kind of cases would you believe him in? If he was sober and if he was not interested.

459. You would believe him on his oath? If he was sober and had no motives to tell a lie.

460. Do you know John Firth? Very well.

461. Had you any business connection with John Firth in the summer of 1887? No; he had been in my employ for five or six years.

462. What one particular business transaction did you have with Firth in 1887? None that I can tell except paying his wages.

463. You remember trying to effect a loan on the south-east part of lots 11 and 12 in the 12th concession of Donald E, 100 acres?

Mr. TAYLOR.—What has that to do with it?

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—You will see when I get through.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not think that has anything at all to do with it.

Hon. Mr. FOSTER.—Tell us what you propose.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I propose to prove by this means, by his affidavit, that Mr. Smyth was in Chatham at the time he was out west, at the time he said he was out west.

Mr. SCARTH.—Fix the dates.

By Mr. Somerville :

464. You remember trying to negotiate this loan for \$2,500 on this land. Do you not? Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR.—I want to know the date he is trying to fix. I have not yet heard the witness fix the date for any time he went away.

By Mr. Somerville :

465. Now you remember having this transaction with George Gordon Martin. Do you? I remember going with Firth to George Gordon Martin.

466. In what month? I don't recollect the year.

467. You recollect the year? No, sir.

468. Did you effect the loan? No, sir.

469. You have no definite knowledge then what time it was? None whatever. I should say it was long prior to 1887.

470. If Mr. Gordon swears that it was in June or July would you believe him? No.

471. I want to put this in as evidence. It is an affidavit? Let me see it. I do not object to it going in.

The CHAIRMAN. If the witness is alive he has got to be here.

The WITNESS.—I said I had no objection to that affidavit going in, and I would rather that it should go in.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the Committee wish it, but as a matter of law I say that it should not go in. The Committee can over-rule me.

Mr. MULOCK.—In connection with this form of examination none of the witnesses are examined upon oath, and the strict rules of evidence are departed from in cases like this. I am not urging that a statement of this kind should be put in, but I do believe that an affidavit, speaking in the abstract without reference to any witness, sworn to and produced by an honorable member, is likely to be quite as reliable as a statement not made under oath. I am not referring to any particular affidavit or any particular bit of evidence, but rules of evidence applicable in a court are hardly applicable in an informal enquiry of this kind.

Mr. TAYLOR.—I presume Mr. Somerville has a pocket full of affidavits and will put them in.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—No, I only had this one. I shall read it. I will read it slowly so that the reporter can take it down: "In the matter of the claim of Henry Smith, ex-M P. —"

Mr. SCARTH.—The reporter is here to report the proceedings of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN.—He cannot report irrelevant matter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I do not wish to read it unless it is taken down.

Mr. WHITE, of Benfrew.—If Mr. Somerville is going to bring Mr. Gordon here, or instead of having his affidavit here he had brought Mr. Gordon here so that he could be cross-examined, I think he would be perfectly within the rules of this Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I was not aware at the time of the last meeting of this Committee that I could get this man's evidence. I did not know anything then about this man. Now, I am in possession of the information which leads me to suppose that he is a good witness. Will I read this or not?

The CHAIRMAN.—If the Committee does not object and Mr. Smyth desires it.

Mr. DAVIES.—The affidavit is not legal evidence. I do not know what is in it. I understand Mr. Somerville to say that it proves one fact, and the witness is desirous it should be read. Then, if any member of the Committee desires to subpoena this gentleman to cross examine him they are open to do it. It might not be necessary to call him at all. Mr. Smyth may admit all the statements in the affidavit.

The CHAIRMAN.—Read the affidavit first.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—Is the reporter to take it down?

The CHAIRMAN.—Not at present.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—Then I shall not read it.

Mr. TAYLOR.—You evidently want to get this in the papers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I am not here to be insulted. I believe I can prove these charges. I have the evidence to prove them, and I say that it is wrong to impute to me motives in this matter when I am prepared to prove every statement I make.

Mr. TAYLOR.—You evidently want to get this into the papers first.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I am not after the papers at all. It is no matter to me whether the papers get it or not. I want this House to know that the Government has been expending this money and the way in which they have been doing it.

Mr. MULOCK.—The best way would be for Mr. Somerville to read this statement in the form of a question.

Mr. WOOD (Brookville).—I object to the reading of this affidavit. There is no lawyer here but what knows that this is highly irregular, and whether the evidence

is under oath or not, at all events he is here for cross-examination. Mr. Somerville has procured this affidavit. When he first got information that he was to get this affidavit he could easily have telegraphed and said we must have the witness here. It is not evidence here. If the affidavit is read it must go down and ought to go down in the report of the evidence. Why introduce these irregular proceedings before the Committee? Mr. Chairman, you as a lawyer know that it has no right to be read as evidence. Mr. Somerville can put the question to this witness based upon the information contained in that affidavit.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is not evidence.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—You rule I cannot read this affidavit.

By Mr. Somerville :

472. Well now, you know this George Gordon Martin? I have already said so.

473. He is a practicing barrister? No, sir, a solicitor, made so last term, I think.

474. You have known him for some years? I have.

475. Did you apply to him on or about the 9th of June, 1887, with one John Firth for a loan of \$2,500 on the south east, 100 acres of lots 11 and 12 in the 12th concession of the township of Donald, in the county of Kent? No, sir.

476. You did not? No, sir.

477. Did you on any occasion apply to him for a loan? Yes. Firth did ask for a loan.

478. You accompanied him when he made this application? I accompanied him when he made an application.

479. Can you fix the date of that application? No, sir.

480. Can you fix the month? I think it was in 1886.

481. What month in 1886? I could not tell. Mr. Firth has been in my employ five or six years, and four or five months ago he went to England.

482. Now, Mr. Smyth, a transaction involving a deal of \$2,500 is not a light matter? My dear sir, I have thousands of these in the year.

483. You cannot fix any date as to this? No.

484. You know the application was made? Yes.

485. You accompanied Mr. Firth? I accompanied Mr. Firth on a single occasion when he made an application.

486. To Mr. George Gordon Martin? Yes.

487. Martin says it was on or about the 1st day of June? 1887?

488. Yes? He is wrong, and he won't come here and state so.

489. Did you not make application for loans and frequently attend Mr. Firth at Gordon Martin's office? No, sir.

490. This man says, that on or about the 1st day of June, 1887, John Firth, and the said Henry Smyth in connection with one Firth, made an application to him for a loan of \$2,500 on the south-east 100 acres, lots 11 and 12 in the 12th concession of the township of Dover, in the county of Kent. You say that is not true? I say that is not true.

By Mr. Wood (Brockville):

491. When this man makes that statement what is your answer to it?

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I don't know the legal way. I want to get at the truth.

Mr. WOOD—That will go down as part of the affidavit which it has been decided ought not to go down.

By Mr. Somerville :

492. If this man states that from the 1st day of June, when you with Mr. Firth went to make this application for a loan of \$2,500, that from the 1st of June onward until about the 1st day of August, 1887, you were almost daily in his office, in the town of Chatham, endeavoring to promote the loan, what would you say to that? I would say he was a liar.

493. And if, Mr. Smyth, this man says and swears: "I have now in my possession certificates and a declaration, dated in June and July, 1887, in connection with said loan brought to my office personally by the said Henry Smyth," would you believe it? No, sir.

494. If he swears that you brought those certificates and declaration to his office personally in June and July, would you believe it? No, sir.

495. And if he says that he believes Henry Smyth was in the town of Chatham continuously from the 1st of June, 1887, until at least the 1st of August, 1887, what would you say? I would say he lied.

496. That is just what he does say? That is just where he lied then.

497. Now, Mr. Smyth— Are you going to put that in? Before whom is it sworn?

498. It is "declared before me in the town of Chatham, in the County of Kent, on the 18th day of March, 1889, 'George B. Douglas, notary public for the Province of Ontario.'"

Mr. TAYLOR—I submit that must be filed.

499. You were a member of this House during the last Parliament? Yes.

500. You are aware that Mr. Campbell ran in the general election of 1887? You were a candidate against Mr. Campbell? Yes.

501. The Conservative candidate? Yes.

502. He defeated you? Yes, sir.

503. His seat was attacked in the courts? Yes.

504. He was unseated? Yes.

505. At what time was he unseated? He says the 2nd of November.

506. Do you not know? No.

507. You think that is correct? I really cannot say.

508. If I produce a *Toronto Mail* that says he was unseated, then will you believe it? Yes, I suppose so.

509. After Mr. Campbell was unseated, was there any meeting of Conservatives to bring out a candidate to oppose Mr. Campbell again? Yes.

510. Who was brought out to oppose him? I was.

511. You were? Yes.

512. Were you present at the meeting or the convention at which you were nominated? Yes, one.

513. Which one? I do not recollect the date. The one in Northwood's Hall.

514. Which one was that? The second.

515. You were not present at the first one? I do not think I was.

516. Do you know when the first one was held? No, nor the second one either.

517. If I would give you the date, I might refresh your memory? Yes.

518. This is the *Free Press*, a good Conservative organ. The *London Free Press* of Thursday, December the 7th, says:—"Mr. Henry Smyth was nominated at the Liberal Convention Saturday at Chatham, to contest the election for the County of Kent." That would be the 3rd of December. Do you know if that date is correct? I do not know when it was. I should say if anything, that it was in the fall.

519. You took so little interest in it, you do not know either the month or the year? I know it was after November, as Mr. Campbell was unseated in November.

520. Were you nominated before or after Mr. Campbell was unseated in November? I really could not say.

521. You were not at that meeting then? I don't recollect that meeting. Where does it say that meeting was?

522. In Chatham, on the 3rd of December, at the Conservative Convention. Do you mean to say, Mr. Smyth, you were not at the Convention which nominated you? I was at the Convention.

523. Do you say you were not at the Convention which nominated you? We had two elections.

524. This was the last election. Will you swear you were not at the Convention when you were first nominated? I won't say I was not.

525. Did you not make a speech there? I think that refers to an informal meeting in that hall.

526. This was the Convention? The Convention in Northwood's Hall I attended.

527. That Convention nominated you? That Convention nominated me.
528. You made a speech there? I made a speech there.
529. After that nomination there was some dissatisfaction amongst the Conservative party about your nomination? Yes; there was something after the meeting.
530. Well, now were you or were you not at the first Convention. That is what I want to know? I believe so.
531. You believe you were at the first Convention? I believe I was at the second Convention.
532. You believe you were at the first Convention? I think so. It was the open public meeting I was at.
533. There was some dissatisfaction there about your candidature amongst the Conservative party and there was a second call of the convention, was there not? There was.
534. Do you remember when the second Convention was held? I do not.
535. How long after the first one was held? I could not tell you.
536. If I refresh your memory perhaps you can remember. Well, now, I see in the London *Free Press* of Wednesday, December 21, the paragraph: "At a largely attended and enthusiastic Conservative Convention at Chatham on Saturday (that would be the 17th of December) at a largely and enthusiastic Conservative Convention at Chatham on Saturday, at which every section of the riding was well represented, the nomination of Mr. Henry Smyth, or the party candidate in the coming election of a member of the House of Commons, was unanimously ratified. Fully 200 delegates were in attendance." Do you remember that meeting? Yes; I was there.
- 536½. And made a speech? And made a speech.
537. There is no question about that? No.
- By Mr. Mulock:*
538. What date was that?
- Mr. SOMERVILLE—The 17th of December.
- By Mr. Somerville:*
539. You were there on the 17th of December? I was there at that meeting. I don't recall the date.
- By Hon. Mr. Bowell:*
540. Was that 1887?
- Mr. SOMERVILLE—Yes.
- By Mr. Somerville:*
541. You are positive you made a speech? I made a speech at the ratification meeting in Northwood Hall.
542. Well is it not a fact, now, Mr. Smyth, that this whole account of yours was made up by your clerk from a memo. handed in by you, giving certain places and hotels got from railway guide books and railway time tables and he was to fill in the dates? No, sir, it was nothing of the kind.
543. You will swear to that? I would swear to it at any time and in any place.
544. Did you render the whole amount of the service—that is, did you put in all the time? I did the work and spent the money, I know.
545. Six months' salary and you claim another half month, you worked six and a half months for the Government that year. You are prepared to swear you worked six and a half months for the Government continuously? Not continuously. No.
546. You put in six and a half months time? If I charged for it I did.
547. You say positively you did not furnish these memorandum books and diaries and tell him to make up that account and put in the dates to suit so as to make the entry cover the period? Certainly not. I gave him the diary and memorandum book and gave him all the information I could to get the accounts correct. I did not care so much about the dates as long as the amounts were correct.
- By Mr. Mulock:*
548. On the 11th of June, 1887, did you charge for expenses throughout the County of Essex, \$27.50. Is that correct? Yes.

549. On the 12th of June, you charge for a horse and buggy going to Tupperville. Is that correct? I do not remember the date.

W. W. MITCHELL, called and examined.

By Mr. Somerville:

550. You live at Chatham? I do, sir.

551. You occasionally do work for Mr. Smyth? I do, sir.

552. You did some work in preparing this account? I did some. I think it is all my work.

553. When you made up this account what information had you to enable you to do it? The information I had was a small diary in the first instance. The first part of it was kept in a small diary and the second part in a small memorandum book.

554. What were the nature of the entries? The first part of it was the name of the places that Mr. Smyth had visited and parties who he wished to have pamphlets addressed to or whom he wished to see, and the latter part of it was a diary of his expenses, the amounts he had expended.

555. Were the expenses in the diary part or the places? The one was in the first part and the other in the latter part.

556. The dates, what was there? Just what I tell you.

557. But you have mixed it up? He kept a memorandum of the place he had visited in the first part.

558. That is where the dates are? Yes.

559. I understand you that the diary fixed the places where he was, where he visited, the hotel he stopped at and the trips he made? Yes.

560. And the tickets he purchased? Yes.

561. From one point to the other? Not the tickets he purchased and the expense he was at, that was in the back part.

562. And the places were in the diary? Yes, in the first part.

563. Regularly kept? You might call it regularly, but the dates were run together so that I could not make them out.

564. Was it not his habit when he came to an entry in the place allowed for that entry to try and get it in, as he said himself, by writing it up the side? He would write anywhere.

565. This was the data he gave you to make up the account? That was what I had.

566. It was a diary with the names of the places he had visited? Yes.

567. And this other memorandum book had the expense account? No, in the same diary. This was in the front part.

568. I see, in the account at the end. Were there any dates for them? Yes; the dates to correspond with the ones in front and that is the way I came to make out the account.

569. Did you examine them to see that they corresponded? I do not remember. I do not think they corresponded. When I went to speak to Mr. Smyth about the dates, he told me he did not think there was anything particular about the dates as long as I got in the time.

570. How long were you to put in? Five months.

571. But you got in six months and a-half? There was a month and a-half before that.

572. The dates were not so important as long as you got in the money? I am satisfied he put in the time.

573. You think this memorandum gave the correct dates? What did he say about them, that those were the correct dates? He told me that those were the dates or near them.

574. On the book you say there were dates too? In some places.

575. You compared these dates with the dates in the diary where he was at a certain place and thought them correct? In some instances only. In some instances there were no dates at all.

576. Your general instructions were to make out the accounts for the Government from these two books or from this one book? There were two books.

577. Did you foot up the expenses at the end? I did. I went to Mr. Smyth and he told me that it was not exactly the amount. He thought it was some \$13 short.

578. From your recollection of the writing in this book, do you think it was written at different times? I do.

579. Where is that book? I could not say at the present time where it is. I did not know that it was of very great importance, and put it up with some other papers that I had, and I thought I would be able to put my hand on it before I came away, but I was not.

580. When Mr. Smyth told you you were subpoenaed down here, did he ask you to find this book? He did.

581. Did you look for it? I did think I could put my hand on it, and I went on Saturday morning to get it, and I could not, and Mr. Smyth told me I would have to come down here.

582. Why come with evidence that was given by Mr. Smyth already? Because I could not find it, sir. A number of the papers had become destroyed. I did not consider that they were of any great importance, and it is a long time since the account was made out.

583. Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Smyth in his evidence—I do not know whether I am right in saying that—Mr. Smyth in his evidence has stated that the dates of this account that you made out, that the dates could not be relied on? No, sir. The dates are wrong, I am satisfied, and it comes from the reason that I gave.

584. If the dates are right in the diary, surely they must be right here? Some of them might be right.

585. Would they not of necessity be right? No. I would not swear.

586. You did not copy them out of the diary perfectly? I could not say that I did.

587. You cannot swear that you copied them correctly? I would not swear that I did.

588. You would have no motive in making any mistakes in it? Nothing at all, sir. It was nothing to me.

589. Really you agree with Mr. Smyth then that these dates are not correct? I do.

590. Although you think the dates in the memo. book were copied by yourself? Some of them may have been copied. I could not say they were. I think the account commences in June, does it not?

591. Yes. When did you make out this account? It was about Christmas that I made it out.

592. The 24th December. That is the date is it? That might not have been the date as it was not finished by me on the day it was started.

593. How long did it take you to finish it? I could not say.

594. Would it be a day? It might have been a week or two weeks, because it was sometime before I found him.

595. After you made it out? Yes.

596. Did you send it to the Government? I mailed it, sir.

597. Did Smyth enclose a letter with it? I don't think so.

598. You think not? I don't think so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—Well, I don't know that I have any further questions to ask the witness.

By Mr. Smyth:

599. You had been in my employ in 1883 and 1884? Yes.

600. Continuously? In 1883 and 1884, I think.

601. In what capacity? As book-keeper and clerk.

602. In 1887 in whose employ were you? In the employ of the Biscuit Works.

603. In what capacity? As collector.

604. And book-keeper? Yes, as book-keeper.

605. You were not in my employ continuously though you had done work for me? Yes.

606. Very much? Quite a bit.

607. In what way? In sending out and addressing pamphlets to different parts of the United States.

608. And in writing generally? Yes, in writing generally.

609. Do you remember writing me at any point in the North-West. In the first place, did you have a key to my box in the Post Office? In my absence did you have the key to my box, after the 26th February, 1887, that is a few days after Mr. Campbell defeated me; to your certain knowledge what length of time was I in Chatham? I cannot say, Mr. Smyth; but I do not think it would have been over two months. Six weeks or two months.

610. Were you in the habit of getting my letters from the Post Office? Yes, I was.

611. Did you have letters from me from any part of our North-West and in the Western States? I had.

612. Can you tell me where? I had letters from you from Omaha.

Mr. MULOCK—He has the letters, I suppose?

Mr. SMYTH—He is on his cross-examination.

Mr. MULOCK—I know. I suppose the information would be the letters. The only place he knew where the letters came from would be the postmarks.

The CHAIRMAN—It is good evidence to show where he received the letters from.

613. From what point were these letters received? Omaha, Helena, Emerson, Kansas City, Lethbridge and some other places I do not remember.

614. St. Paul? I think there were some from St. Paul.

615. In pursuance of these letters what did you do? I mailed pamphlets to the directions you had sent, to the directions you had given me in these letters, of the parties in the different places and attended to other business you wanted me to attend to.

616. Now, for what length of time were you engaged, off and on, working on pamphlets? To what extent were they sent? They were sent for several months. I cannot remember exactly the time.

617. Did I compensate you for your work? You gave me \$50.

618. Was that mentioned in the account? That was not.

619. That was omitted. Now—

By the Chairman :

620. Was Mr. Smyth at these particular points where you directed the pamphlets to? I believe so, sir.

By Mr. Smyth :

621. How do you know these letters were from St. Paul, Lethbridge and Omaha? By the post mark and directions.

622. You have no reason to doubt their authenticity? I have not, sir. I know nothing.

623. You knew the post marks? Yes.

624. Now, in reference to my letters, the letters I received through the post office: have you been in the habit, in my absence, of taking those letters from my box? I have, sir.

625. You have used the same box? Yes.

626. Did you, on that occasion, have any instructions as to forwarding my letters to me at different points? Yes, sir, I was to forward all important letters.

627. You opened the letters? Yes.

628. You were authorized to see and send my letters to what points, can you recall? I sent letters to you at Omaha, to Helena, and I think I sent letters to you at St. Paul; I think these are about the places I sent them to.

629. Now, in the early part of the account, in the early part of the year, do you remember that I was very industrious myself in the circulation of pamphlets? You were, sir.

630. Most continually on the run? Yes.

By Mr. Somerville :

631. I want to ask you one question : I understood you to say that after Mr. Smyth was appointed—you knew when he was appointed, didn't you? I did not.

632. You knew when he started to discharge his duties? I could not say, I do not think, when he started. I did not know Mr. Smyth was appointed until some-time afterwards.

633. When? I could not say. For two months after he was appointed he was away for awhile, and I did not know what he was away for.

634. You have a good memory. Do you think it was two months? It might have been two months, and it might not have been that long.

635. You say it might have been two months? It might have been.

636. How long do you think it was? I could not say.

637. Was it seven weeks? I could not say.

638. It would not be less than six weeks, would it? I could not say.

639. You say you think it was about two months?

Mr. SMYTH.—He said he did not know when I was appointed. He already told Mr. Somerville that he did not know when I was appointed. How can he say when a certain thing took place afterwards?

640. Mr. Smyth's appointment was the 7th of May. You remember that summer? Yes.

641. I understood you to say Mr. Smyth was not home more than six weeks or two months during that summer? I do not think he was.

642. Was he home two months? I know he was away a great deal that summer.

643. You saw him frequently? No, I did not.

644. You knew when he was home? Yes, I would know when he was home.

645. Do you think he would be home two months? No.

646. Was he home six weeks? I think he might have been.

647. You are secretary of the Conservative Association there? One of them.

648. Which one? The local one.

649. Who is secretary of the other? Mr. Bottoms is of the other.

650. You take an interest in politics? Yes.

651. Local as well as Dominion? Yes, a little all round.

652. You know that after Mr. Campbell was unseated that the Conservatives held a convention? Yes.

653. You were not the secretary of that convention? I was not.

654. Were you there? I think I was there.

655. Did you hear any speeches. Was it a good lively meeting? I do not know that it was more than usual.

657. Who did you hear make a speech there? I heard Mr. Isaac Smyth make a speech.

658. Who was nominated for the Dominion? Several.

659. Who got the nomination? Mr. Henry Smyth.

660. Was Mr. Henry Smyth there? I do not know.

661. You must know. You must know whether he was there or not. He was the man who was nominated? He was; but I do not think he was present at the nomination.

662. You were at the second meeting afterwards when there was some dissatisfaction of Mr. Smyth? I was not present.

663. You were not at the second meeting? No.

By Mr. Taylor :

664. You reside in Chatham? Yes.

665. Were you there during the months of July and June, of 1887? Yes, to the best of my knowledge I was.

666. You were in the town of Chatham during the months of June and July of 1887? Yes.

667. Did Mr. Smyth reside in Chatham and remain there continuously during those two months? No, he was not living in Chatham during those months. telegraphed him to come home in June.

668. So that if George Gordon Martin swears that: "I am well acquainted with the above Henry Smyth, ex-M.P. for Kent, Ont. On or about the 1st day of June, 1887, the said Henry Smyth, in connection with one John Firth, made application to me for a loan of \$2,500 on the south-east 100 acres, lots 11 and 12. in the 12th concession of the Township of Dover East, County of Kent. That from said 1st June, 1887, onwards, until about the 1st day of August, 1887, the said Smyth was almost daily at my office in said town of Chatham actively promoting the said loan." Now, if Mr. George Gordon Martin swears that Mr. Smyth was in Chatham almost daily, he swears what is false? I know Mr. Martin pretty well. I think he does.

By Mr. Somerville :

669. One moment. After you telegraphed to Mr. Smyth, he admits himself that he came back. He admits himself that he was in Chatham for some time? To the best of my knowledge he was not.

670. How long was he in Chatham? I know he was not there much of the time.

671. He was not in the North-West? Not in June.

672. Do you know of his whereabouts in July? I think he was not home in July.

673. Are you sure? I am almost positive.

674. You would not be willing to swear? No.

675. It was possible he was there too? He might have been there.

By Mr. Scarth :

676. Is it possible he was there continuously from the 1st of June to the 1st of August? No; it is impossible.

By Mr. Mulock :

677. You made out the account that has been rendered? I did.

678. You made it from information given by Mr. Smyth? Yes, from the papers I had.

679. From the diary he gave you? From entries in that diary? In whose handwriting were they? Mr. Smyth's.

By Mr. Somerville :

680. Was Mr. Smyth in Chatham in December, 1887? He was at the end. It must have been between Christmas and New Year's.

681. He was not any other time in December? Not that I know of.

682. You did not see him in Chatham at all? I saw him very little.

683. You did not see him in Chatham at all in December? I do not think so.

684. If Smyth swears he was there in the early part of December, what would you say to that? I would say he told the truth. He ought to know better than I do whether he was or not.

685. He says he was at that Conservative Convention? Well, he must know.

686. Your memory is not correct as to that? It might not be. No, I could not say whether he was there or not.

687. Have you a good memory? A fairly good memory.

688. If Mr. Smyth said he was there you would believe it? I would, sir.

The Committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 9th April, 1889.

Committee met; Mr. Rykert in the chair.

G. G. MARTIN, of Chatham, Ont., called and examined.

By Mr. Somerville :

689. Give your name in full. George Gordon Martin.

690. Where do you reside? In the town of Chatham.

691. What is your occupation? Loan and real estate agent and conveyancer.

692. Do you know Henry Smyth? Yes; I know him well.

693. How long have you known Mr. Smyth? About 13 years, I guess.
694. Did you have any business transactions with Mr. Smith in the year 1887?
Yes, sir.
695. What were they? He was transacting a loan through me on some real estate in the township of Dover.
696. What month did he commence to negotiate this loan? I am pretty sure it was the latter part of May. It might possibly be the first of June. The latter part of May, I think.
697. The latter part of May or the first of June? About that time.
698. In what year? 1887.
699. How long did this negotiation continue between Mr. Smyth and you?
There were many delays in connection with the matter, and they continued all summer.
700. All summer? Yes; all summer.
701. During the negotiations did Mr. Smyth hand you any certificates in connection with the loan? Yes, sir.
702. Do you recognize that certificate? Yes; it is dated 6th June, 1887. (See Exhibit No. 1.)
703. It is signed by William Douglas? Yes, William Douglas.
704. Who is William Douglas? Mr. Douglas is the Crown Attorney.
705. Clerk of the Peace and Crown Attorney? Yes.
706. That is with regard to the land on which Mr. Smyth wanted to obtain the loan? That is a short description of the property.
707. What land is it? Parts of lots 11 and 12 in the 12th concession in the Township of Dover East, County of Kent.
708. What valuation did Douglas place on that lot? \$45 an acre.
709. A hundred acres, is it? Yes.
710. That is \$4,500? Yes.
711. Well, did Mr. Smyth hand you any other certificate with regard to this matter? Yes.
712. Where was this certificate given to you? In my office.
713. What date? The day it bears date; on that day.
714. It was presented to you on the 6th of June in your office? Yes.
715. By whom? Mr. Smyth.
716. Well, were there any other certificates given to you? There was another, I think.
717. There is one, I see? There is the certificate of the 6th of June.
718. I just want to fix the dates; when was that one given you? That is not a certificate, that is a declaration.
719. Did you get the certificate in July? I got that declaration in July.
(See Exhibit No. 2.)
- By the Chairman:*
720. What is the date of it? It is sworn to on the 5th July.
- By Mr Somerville:*
721. When was that certificate given to you? It was sworn by him and brought to me by Mr. Smyth on the 5th of July.
722. It was brought to your office by Mr. Smyth and presented to you on that day? Yes; I wrote the declaration myself and he took it away with him and had the man make the declaration.
723. Smyth did that? Yes.
724. On the 5th of July? Yes.
725. What year? 1887.
726. Were any other papers given you by Mr. Smyth in the matter? There was an agreement between Mr. Smyth and myself regarding the loan.
727. The agreement; is that the agreement? (See Exhibit No. 3.) That is the agreement.
728. What is the date of that agreement? On the 12th October, 1887.

729. 12th October, 1887? Yes.

730. That is Mr. Smyth's signature to that, is it? Yes, that is Mr. Smyth's signature.

731. When did you get possession of this? I got possession of it the day it was dated. That is in my own handwriting.

732. It was written in your office by yourself? Yes, by myself, and signed on that date by Mr. Smyth.

733. Signed on that date by Mr. Smyth? Yes.

734. Now, in your declaration which you made in the matter on the 18th of March in connection with this matter (see Exhibit No. 4) you say that "I have now in my possession certificates and declarations dated in June and July, 1887, in connection with the said loan, and I believe the said Henry Smyth was in the said town of Chatham continuously from the 1st of June, 1887 until at least the 1st of August, 1887." Is that correct? Well, it is just as correct as I think there. Of course I cannot say positively that Mr. Smyth was in Chatham during the month of August, but my impression is, of course, what I say. I only swear to the best of my information and belief. I believe he was there.

735. You believe he was there? I do. I could not say positively. He might not.

736. Were there any circumstances in connection with this loan that would cause you to be impressed with the idea that he was there up to the 1st of August? Well, I should think there were.

737. State them? Mr. Smyth was very anxious and very desirous to prosecute this loan through, and complete it if possible within as short a time as we could, and Mr. Smyth is a very active man himself, and he was actively aiding and assisting me from day to day and week to week, right throughout the summer, as far as I remember, in getting the loan through.

738. Was he in and out of your office? Yes, in and out.

739. Frequently? Oh, yes.

740. Every week? Yes, every week that he was there.

741. Up to the 1st of August, you say in your declaration? That is my recollection, that he was in and out pretty much every day in connection with this land up to the 1st of August, and as far as I remember during the month of August. It is possible he was not there during the month of August.

742. I see negotiations were kept up until the 12th of October? Yes, my recollection is that they were continuously kept up until the 12th of October.

743. You are certain about the year? Certainly; I make no mistake.

744. You think that even after the 1st of August, Mr. Smyth was in your office? Yes; that is my recollection.

745. Up to the 12th of October? Yes, but I would not be sure about it.

746. You would be about as sure as a man could be about it? Yes, that is my recollection and firm impression, that between the time the loan was instituted in June, up to the 12th of October, 1887, Mr. Smyth was in and out of my office in Chatham actively.

747. From week to week? Yes, sir; sometimes from day to day. Sometimes half a dozen times in a day. That is my recollection.

748. You have a good recollection and you are quite positive about that? There is a possibility of my being mistaken. I do not think there can be any doubt about the 1st of June and the 1st of August; but between the 1st of August and the date of that agreement, the 12th of October, there may be some possibility of mistake. This was away back a couple of years.

749. But I understand you are positive of his being in and out of your office, day after day and week after week, from the 1st of June until the 1st of August? I am just as sure of it as a man can be, without being able to swear positively to it.

750. He could not have been away? I do not think so.

751. For a week? No; I do not say he could not have been away a week during that time. He might have been away a week.

752. After the 1st of August to the 12th of October you say Mr. Smyth's negotiations continued? Yes, that is my firm recollection; that during that whole summer he and I were both engaged in connection with that loan.

753. Then your idea, or impression, or conviction is that he was in Chatham the whole or nearly the whole of that summer? That is just exactly my impression.

754. Up to the 12th of October, 1887? Yes.

755. Well, were you in Chatham in December, 1887? I was.

756. Do you remember that after Mr. Campbell was unseated at the bye-election that the Conservatives held a convention in December, 1887. I remember it well.

757. About what time was it held? Early in the fall.

758. The first convention, when was it held? I cannot give the date.

759. Was it held in December? I think it was, but I would not be sure of that.

760. Was it in December? Early in the fall, I think.

761. I may say that we fixed the date by the London *Free Press* at the last meeting, as the 3rd of December, which was the first week in December. I would not say that. I remember the convention well enough.

762. It was early in the fall? Yes.

763. Do you know whether Mr. Smyth was at that Convention? I don't know whether he was at it or not.

764. Well, did you see Mr. Smyth on the day the Convention was held? I did, but I did not see him at the Convention. I don't know whether he was at the Convention, but I saw him in town.

765. The day of the first Convention? Yes.

766. Were you talking to him? I could not say that. I don't think I was.

767. You saw him? Yes.

768. Around the streets? Yes.

769. Talking to other people? Yes. I took some interest in the political events myself and there was some excitement about it. I would not be mistaken in seeing Henry Smyth at that time.

770. You could not be mistaken? No.

771. There was some dissatisfaction about Mr. Smyth's nomination? I know there was.

772. A good deal of discontent amongst the Conservatives? Yes.

773. There was another Convention? Yes.

774. What time was that held? That was held some weeks afterwards.

775. The date was on the 17th? It was held some weeks afterwards. I could not give you the date.

776. It was about two or three weeks after the other? Yes; shortly afterwards.

777. Do you know whether Mr. Smyth was at that Convention or not? I do not.

778. Did you see him there on the street on the day of that Convention? Very likely I did if he was there, but I would not say I did. I would not say anything about the second Convention. The interest in the matter commenced to wane about that time. I did not care anything about the second Convention.

779. Mr. SOMERVILLE.—Smyth admits he was at that convention himself. Well—I don't think I have any other questions to ask the witness. Oh, just allow me a moment, you say Mr. Smyth came into your office on the 6th of June, and presented a certificate to you? Yes.

780. On the 7th of July he presented a certificate? On the 5th of July, not a certificate but that declaration.

781. Well, I see by Mr. Smyth's account that he bought a ticket on the 1st of July, a ticket and sleeper to St. Paul, and the next day is 7th July, expenses one week at St. Paul Merchants' Hotel. It would be impossible for Mr. Smyth to be in St. Paul or have left Chatham on these dates? I think it would be impossible for Mr. Smyth to go on the 1st of July and be back on the 5th of July.

782. He is here on the 7th? He certainly did not go to St. Paul on the 7th.

783. He could not be in St. Paul on the 7th? I don't know. He gave me that certificate on the 5th. It does not take over two days to go to St. Paul, I don't think it would be physically impossible.

By Mr. Taylor :

784. He might have been there? I don't think it is impossible at all; you can go to St. Paul from Chatham in about twenty four or twenty-five hours.

785. He might have gone there and been away two days? There is no physical impossibility about it.

786. I say he might have gone? Of course, he might for all I know.

By Mr. Somerville :

787. He was in your office and presented you with that agreement on the 12th of October, was he? Certainly; there is no doubt about that.

788. I see by his account on the 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th he was in Kansas City? That would be impossible, unless he could double himself up.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—He can do that pretty well.

By Mr. Smyth :

789. I am usually very active when I am in Chatham? Very much so.

790. When I am there everybody knows it pretty well? I should think so. You are of sufficient importance for everybody to be aware of it.

791. Now, are you aware, Mr. Gordon, that I was driving a good deal through the county in the month of May? I think you were. I think I met you several times myself.

792. I have a letter here to the Minister of 10th May, 1887. (See Exhibit No. 5) It reads:—"Please have the British Columbia pamphlets sent to the persons whose names are set out on the enclosed list." Among these names are:—W. C. Smith, R. Morgan, George J. Longworth, John Bess, John Johnson (list continued). Do you recognize those names as the names of Kent men? Yes, I do. Every one of them.

793. Here is a letter, "Chatham, May, 1887." (See Exhibit No. 6.) "I have just returned from seeing Thomas Buckingham." Do you know Thomas Buckingham? Yes, very well.

Mr. SOMERVILLE—I do not want to have these proceedings interrupted, but he is away back in May. You have already ruled in the case of Mr. Webster, that we have no right to go back to that.

The CHAIRMAN—I have ruled that all papers in connection with these matters have a right to be before the Committee. I did not stop you from examining Mr. Webster up to January of this year. There are letters in the Department in connection with the matter.

794. Do you know Mr. Wemp, who was killed in the late accident at St. George? Yes; a personal friend of my own.

795. How was he employed? He was a very active man.

796. For what line? I do not know.

797. Was it not the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul? Yes.

798. Do you know Henry Mercer? Yes.

799. An active agent, is he? Yes.

800. Mr. James Senter, is he an active agent for American lands? Yes.

801. Atkinson and Risbon, are they very active agents for these lands? Yes.

802. Do you know what inducements are held out to our young men to go to their territories? You have come across them? I know they have an immense mass of pamphlets. I know Atkinson and Risbon have. They sent one of those pamphlets to myself.

803. An immense mass of pamphlets and American literature? They are very actively engaged in distributing the pamphlets. They sent one to myself.

804. Are you aware, Mr. Martin, that they held out inducements in the shape of low rates of transportation? Atkinson and Risbon do.

805. Are you not aware that James Senter does? I could not say. I heard he did.

806. Have you any reason to doubt that he did? I have not the slightest.

807. "Chatham, 13th May, 1887." I would like to put this in. The reason I was prompted to read this letter was that it contains the names of persons I had sent the Department and sent Mr. Lowe, I know that there are other letters in the Department. I was in the Department yesterday and got this letter. It appears that there was some delay in the sending of literature to the parties in Chatham and I sent this letter. (Letter read, See Exhibit No. 7.) I think you drove out with me on one occasion? Yes.

808. Were you aware of my business at that time? I understood that is what you were at.

809. On the 16th of May I wrote the Department. (See Exhibit No. 8.) Please give instructions that this party referred to be sent at once copies of your British Columbia and North-West pamphlets (Signed) H. W. Smyth. This is from the Chatham *Banner*: "Mr. James C. Fleming of Chatham Township sold his farm last week. Mr. Fleming we regret to hear contemplates moving to the States in the fall." Do you know Mr. Fleming? Yes.

810. He is treasurer of the municipality now? Yes.

811. He did not go, fortunately for us, to the American side, and he sold his farm? Yes.

812. Here is one of the same date: "Chatham, 16th May, 1887," enclosing a clipping from the Chatham *Banner*. (See Exhibit No. 9.)

813. That was one of the schemes of the American railway people to make it palatable, to get it up in the guise of something else? Yes.

814. (After reading from a newspaper clipping, see Exhibit No. 8.) Do you remember Mr. Fleming very well? Yes.

815. Do you remember Mr. P. K. Black, of Blenheim? I do not know him very well.

816. You remember Mr. Black? I remember the name; I do not know him.

817. I have a clipping here (see Exhibit No. 9): "Samuel Woodcock left for Dakota, &c." Do you know him? No.

818. This Mr. Thos. Buckingham, in connection with whom I read that letter (see Exhibit No. 6), you remember him? Yes.

819. In reference to this gentleman, I may say that I wrote Mr. Lowe for pamphlets to be sent to these names. Then I met Mr. Buckingham, and he wanted our North-West land laws or regulations, so I wrote Mr. Low again, and I see the original letter was transferred to the Department of the Interior. (See Exhibit No. 10.) I have been told since by Mr. Buckingham that he got the papers. Do you remember a conversation with me, Mr. Martin, and the suggestion on your part that the Canadian Pacific pamphlets should be more freely circulated? Yes, I do.

Mr. Smyth here read his letter of the 28th May, 1887, to Mr. Van Horne, respecting the distribution of the Canadian Pacific Railway pamphlets, and also Mr. Van Horne's letter in reply. (See Exhibit No. 11.)

820. You remember a trip I took in Essex when you asked me to value a bit of property that was put before you below Tilbury Centre. Do you remember a place that you asked me to make a valuation of as I passed by? Yes, in connection with some land.

Mr. Smyth here read his letter of the 9th June, 1887, to the Department of Agriculture, in which reference was made to his return from a tour through the county of Essex, and intimated that he had found that district flooded with American maps. (See Exhibit No. 12.)

Mr. MULOCK.—Where is that written from?

Mr. SMYTH.—Chatham, on the 9th June. There is the map of Dakota.

821. I think I referred in one of my letters to the large number of American pamphlets I found in Canada circulated, I think I sent them to Mr. Carling. Here is the list referred to (see Exhibit No. 7). Looking through that list, do you recognize the names of Kent men? Yes; every one of them pretty well, I know most of them myself. This is dated 28th May, 1887.

822. It encloses a long list of names. I think I referred to them in the letter to Mr. Carling. I think this is the list I said to Mr. Carling "I am sending pamphlets to." I propose now, sir, to read my report of 31st May, and put it in. I do not want to take up the time of the Committee unnecessarily, but I think it is necessary that I should put in this statement, and under the circumstances, to get everything in from start to finish. (See Exhibit No. 13.)

Mr. MULOCK.—Is it necessary to read it, in order to examine the witness?

Mr. SMYTH.—I just want to read it, in order that it should come in.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—His work in Kent is not questioned at all.

By Mr. Smyth:

823. How is your memory as to dates? Very bad, indeed.

824. Can you without reference to some paper—can you trust a date as far back as 1887 without you have something by which you can fix the date? I could not. I am especially poor in that line. I cannot remember dates at all.

825. And without something by which you can fix the time, you would not be able to state the date of any occurrence having transpired as far back as 1887? Not on a certain date. Unless I could place it through some circumstances, I do not think I could.

826. Now, looking at the paper of the 5th of July (see Exhibit No. 2), who did you say affixed the date? I think that figure is in my own handwriting.

827. You think that, that figure "5." Don't you think, Mr. Martin, looking at that again, that this is Mr. Douglas' figure 5? It might very possibly be.

828. It might possibly be Mr. Douglas' figure? There is no "th" to it. It is the bare figure.

829. Look at the ink? The ink of the "5" seems to be darker. It seems to be different ink. I cannot say positively whether I made that figure or not.

830. Who is the deponent? Who made that affidavit? That is the declarant.

831. Who is the declarant? John Firth.

832. Where is John Firth now? I don't know; it would be hard to tell.

833. You heard he was in England? Yes, you told me he was in England.

834. I have had letters from him from England. He is in England and will be back here shortly. I just wanted to ask Mr. Martin in reference to that, because I am satisfied that this is Mr. Douglas' figure. Now I am speaking of June. Going back to June can you speak positively as to my whereabouts in June; without reference to some paper can you speak positively as to my movements in the month of June? I could not say I could speak positively.

835. Referring to this application for the loan, when was the time that the application was begun and I brought you the certificates? It was begun, I think, at the latter end of May.

836. And I was almost continuously with you. Where do you get that from? That is my impression.

837. Would it be possible that during the month of June, I took you the paper the first week in June? Would it be possible that I was away from home at all in June? I am just asking you do you recollect without reference to dates. You say I was in your office on the 5th or 6th of June when I gave you these certificates? (See Exhibits 14 and 15.) Yes.

838. Would you be surprised to know that I was away from home for quite a while? I think I would.

839. Would you be surprised to know that you wrote me a letter from Chatham to a point outside of Chatham in the month of June? I might have.

840. Remember your recollection as to dates is not good; mine is not? I might have written.

841. You might have done so? Yes; possibly.

842. I show you a letter which I have here; I ask you whether it is in your handwriting or not; is that your writing? That is my writing; yes.

843. This is dated: "Chatham, 16th June, 1887. My dear Smyth.—*Re loan, &c.* (Signed) Gordon Martin." (See Exhibit No. 16.)

THE CHAIRMAN.—Who was that addressed to ?

Mr. SMYTH.—It don't say.

WITNESS.—I am perfectly satisfied that it was addressed to you ; probably to you in Ottawa. I never sent you a letter out of Canada in my life.

Mr. SMYTH.—I am only saying your memory may be at fault in respect to dates.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—Where is the envelope ?

Mr. SMYTH.—I did not keep it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—It does not amount to anything in that way.

Mr. SMYTH.—I only want to bear out what Mr. Martin says. It is impossible for him to state a date as a fact without something to show.

By Mr. Smyth :

844. When I failed to call at your office did you usually drop me a note—when I failed to call in connection with a loan ? In June did you drop me a note or an epistle ? I did, several times.

845. Now, Mr. Martin, you know Mr. Samuel Barfoot ? I know him well ; that is the postmaster.

846. Is he a man whose word you would believe under oath ? I would believe his word without an oath.

847. Do you know Mr. Barfoot's signature ? I do ; well.

848. Is that it ? That is it.

849. That is his signature ; that is a declaration sworn to before whom ? W. J. Martin.

850. Now, I don't know whether this will be admitted as evidence or not : "I, Samuel Barfoot, of the town of Chatham, in the county of Kent, postmaster, do solemnly declare that during the summer and fall of 1887 Mr. Henry Smyth, ex-M.P. for Kent, was absent from the town of Chatham the greater portion of the time as nearly as I can remember. In his absence Mr. William Mitchell, formerly in his employ, obtained his business letters from the post office and Mr. Mitchell's letters are always placed in Mr. Smyth's box in the office." (See Exhibit No. 17). You know Mr. Mitchell who gave his evidence here the other day ? Yes.

851. Is he a respectable man ? I think so.

852. Is that his signature ? I don't know his signature.

853. I find here that Mr. Mitchell makes a declaration as follows :—

Mr. MULOCK—I think Mr. Mitchell has been here and has given his evidence. He has been examined.

Mr. SMYTH—If you object to it, it need not go in as evidence. Mitchell can be brought here again. It is only to spare the expense.

Mr. MULOCK—If that declaration is read it should not be taken down, Mr. Chairman, as evidence.

Mr. Smyth reads declaration which is handed in, marked Exhibit No. 18.

Mr. SOMERVILLE—That is what he stated in his evidence.

Mr. SMYTH—I think my report omits the name of the gentleman I met in Emerson, who gave me a lot of information and took a good deal of trouble with me. The name is Duncan McArthur, of Winnipeg.

By Mr. Smyth :

854. Is that Andrew Northwood's signature ? Yes.

855. Andrew Northwood is an important man in Chatham ? Yes.

856. Thoroughly responsible ? Yes.

Mr. Northwood's declaration was here read and put in and marked Exhibit No. 19.

857. Now, Mr. Martin, do you know Mrs. Street ? I don't know.

858. A point was endeavored to be made against me at the last meeting of this Committee by Mr. Somerville, who had some papers from the town of Chatham, when I was an arbitrator in the matter between the town of Chatham and Mrs. Street, respecting the prolongation of Foster Street. Do you know Mr. Bismard ? Yes.

859. That is his signature ? Yes.

860. He is a good man ? Yes, first class. (His declaration was here read and put in, marked Exhibit No. 20.)

861. Here is what Mrs. Street swears to, in connection with this transaction. (Mrs. Street's declaration was read and marked Exhibit No. 21.)
862. Now, I am going to ask you as to names? Do you know the Chandler family? (See Exhibit No. 22.) Yes.
863. Good respectable people? Yes.
864. Do you know Mr. Wm. Needham? (See Exhibit No. 23.) Yes.
865. Do you know James Cohan? (See Exhibit No. 24.) Yes.
866. A good man? Yes.
867. A prominent man in Chatham? Yes.
868. Do you know Mr. Warren Lambert? (See Exhibit No. 25.) Yes.
869. A good man? Yes.
870. A prominent man? Yes.
871. Do you know T. A. Smith? (See Exhibit No. 26.) Yes.
872. A good man? Yes.
873. Do you know Warren Lambert's signature? (See Exhibit No. 26a.) Yes.
874. Do you know Mr. Dezalin, the freight agent of the Erie and Huron Railway? Yes.
875. How far is that from my home? A short distance.
876. He says fifty yards. (See Exhibit No. 27.) Do you know John A. Jermyn? (See Exhibit No. 28.) I do not. I have heard the name. I don't know him. I know who he is. I don't know him, and I don't know anything about him.
877. Do you know R. L. Holden? (See Exhibit No. 29.) A painter.
878. Do you know Tessiman's signature? (See Exhibit No. 30.) Yes.
879. Do you know Wm. Douglas, Q.C.? I do well.
880. Is that his signature? (See Exhibit No. 21.) Yes.
881. Do you know Mr. Tissiman's signature? Yes.
882. I wish to read this right here. Do you know Messrs. Colby and Campbell? (See Exhibit No. 31.) I know them well.
883. They are responsible and respectable men? Yes.
884. Do you remember Oscar Arnold? (See Exhibit No. 32.) I know who he is first rate.
885. He is dead now? Yes.
886. And Charles Sheffield. Do you know him? (See Exhibit No. 33.) Yes.
887. That will be all.
- By Mr. Taylor:*
888. That is your signature, is it, Mr. Martin? (Producing Exhibit No. 4.) That is it.
889. You made that declaration? Yes.
890. In this declaration you say: "I believe the said Henry Smyth was continuously in the town of Chatham from the first of June, 1887, until the first of August, 1887?" Yes.
891. "And I make this solemn declaration?" I thought so, and I think so yet.
892. Did you not say here a few moments ago he might have been absent for a week? So he might, but I don't think he was.
893. You do not think now he was absent? My impression is that he was in Chatham endeavoring to obtain this loan from its inception up to at least the first of August, but he might have been away.
894. If all these facts that are filed here, of all these gentlemen whom you say you know—if they all state positively that during the months of June and July Mr. Smyth was continuously absent from Chatham, what will you say? If these gentlemen whose names are to these affidavits will swear positively that Smyth was absent during that time I will give in at once that these people must be right.
895. And you wrong? Yes, except as to the dates in the documents which I have put in.
896. The fifth of June? The 5th of June, and the 12th of October.
897. As to the other dates you are not positive? I would concede the positive affidavit of these respectable people.

By Mr. Somerville :

898. In that declaration you swear to the best of your belief that Smyth was in and out of your office day after day from the first of June to the first of August ?
Yes.

899. That is your belief now ? Certainly.

900. You think he was in and out of your office day after day from the first of June to the first of August ? That is my impression now.

901. You are willing to swear to that ? I am not willing to swear positively to it. I put it as far as my declaration goes.

By Mr Taylor :

902. You say that if those other parties swear to the contrary you will give in to them ? If they swear positively I will have to give in. These are not positive affidavits.

903. Neither was yours ? Certainly not.

By Mr. Smyth :

904. How did you come to make that declaration ? I don't wish—

905. Did you know for what purpose it was to be used ? I did not understand.

906. Who came to you ? I prefer not to answer that.

907. Was it Peter Mackellar, the registrar of Kent ? I would prefer not to mention that.

By Mr. Taylor :

908. That affidavit was put in here to show that Mr. Smyth was continuously there while he was charging for services elsewhere ? I would sooner not answer that.

909. Was it Peter Mackellar ? Of course if I say it was that is what you want. I would sooner not mention any names unless I am compelled.

910. I think the committee ought to know.

The CHAIRMAN—I cannot compel him to answer unless he wants to.

By Mr. Smyth :

911. Do you refuse to answer ? I think it is a delicate thing. I don't like to mention the name of a gentleman coming to my house about a matter of that kind.

912. You did not know for what purpose it was to be used and you would rather not tell who it was ? I would prefer not to say.

By Mr. Mulock :

913. Have you any reason to doubt the correctness of your declaration ? I am satisfied with my declaration.

By Mr. Somerville :

914-15. You understand that these are not positive ? That is what I say, that if these men will swear positively that Mr. Smyth was not in Chatham during the summer of 1887 or during the time I say I think he was there, I would certainly have to yield to a number of respectable people who can say positively what I cannot.

By Mr. Taylor :

916. But you see that all these men declare positively. Do you accept it ?

By Mr. Smyth :

917. You know how active a man I am ? Yes.

918. Everybody knows when I am there ? I should judge if you did your duty they could not get a better man.

919. I am always about the streets ? You are a hustler.

920. Mr. Somerville is anxious that this letter should be put in. It is dated "January 3," "Chatham, Jan. 3, 1887, private."

Hon. Mr. CARLING—I think it is a private letter.

The CHAIRMAN—The unanimous decision of the House has been that letters marked "private" should be treated as such.

Mr. SOMERVILLE—That letter refers to matters in connection with Smyth's special duties after his appointment. I cannot see why there should be any objection to putting it in. There is no private matter in it. It is public business.

Hon. Mr. CARLING—I consider, Mr. Chairman, that any document sent to the Department marked private or confidential it should be considered so, and it should not be given to the public because it was not intended that it should be, and that the hon. gentleman knows. I don't object to the letter being read. I am quite willing that the letter should be read, but it is the principle I am looking at. I am quite willing that that letter should be read to the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN—I don't think it should be.

Mr. SMYTH—Now, gentlemen, I don't wish to detain the Committee, but it was made a point against me here the other day by Mr. Somerville, that I was not able to speak positively as to the dates of a certain petition against the extension of the town limits, and Mr. Somerville was quite surprised at my inability to speak of it. I wish to show that it was before the summer of 1887. Here is something I have from Mr. Tismand, the Town Clerk.

Mr. Smyth here read the declaration of Mr. Tismand, put in and marked Exhibit No. 30.

One of the signers of this petition was actually dead and buried at this time. It was taken for granted in their search through the book of the Clerk of the town of Chatham, that as they found a petition dated the 6th of June, I must have been there then, but it was a petition sent to them long ago. Two of the petitioners were dead: one in 1885 and one in 1886.

HENRY SMYTH re-called, and further examined:

By Mr. Somerville:

921. You have been at Chatham since the last meeting of this Committee? Yes.

922. Did you endeavor to find your diary and memorandum book? Yes, and I have a letter here from Mr. Mitchell somewhere (reads Mr. Mitchell's letter). I have hopes that we may be able to find the books. If so, I will come to Ottawa with them immediately.

923. You were in Chatham? Yes.

924. How many days were you in Chatham? Two days.

925. Did you endeavor to find these books? I gave them to Mr. Mitchell and I know he looked diligently for them. He took them to Craddock's—Craddock's is a law office—they were the solicitors of the biscuit works of which Mr. Campbell's partner is the president. I gave these books to my confidential clerk, or who had been formerly my confidential clerk, but who was now in the employ of the biscuit works, and at odd times he made this account out, at night, or when he had an opportunity. You see the biscuit works had failed. It was the Knights of Labor biscuit works and the institution went into insolvency.

926. Did you use every endeavor to find these books? I could not. In the first place I did not have access to his office. If Mr. Skane has them I think he will institute such a search that they will be found.

Mr. Smyth also put in his report to the Minister of Agriculture, dated 24th December, 1887. (See Exhibit No. 34.)

The Committee then adjourned.

REPORT.

COMMITTEE ROOM, 25th April, 1889.

The Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts beg leave to present the following as their third report :—

Your Committee have had under consideration the items "expenditure for clothing; Militia and Defence," as set forth on page C—190 of the Auditor General's report for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1888; and for the information of the House submit herewith the evidence taken and the papers referred to therein, in connection with the said items.

All which is respectfully submitted.

J. C. RYKERT, *Chairman.*

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 13th March, 1889.

The Public Accounts Committee met; Mr. J. C. Rykert in the Chair.

COL. POWELL called and examined :

By Mr. Mulock :

1. I wish to ask Col. Powell some questions. I may mention that yesterday I received a notice that these papers had been filed. I came up and examined them, and I take this occasion to state, that as I can judge these accounts and papers produced, there was no cause for their not having been produced within a day or two after they were ordered. The labor involved in their preparation was not manual labor which could not have been done in a few hours instead of two weeks. Now, I find a great shortage in what I ordered, I think. I would ask Col. Powell: You are in the Department of Militia? Yes.

2. What is your position there? Adjutant General.

3. What are your duties in connection with the purchase of militia clothing? I have none.

4. No duty whatever? No.

5. Who has? That is done under the direction of the Minister direct.

6. To whom does he give his directions? To Col. Macpherson, who has direct charge of it.

7. Have you had anything to do with it under the orders of the Minister—with the purchase of clothing for the militia? Yes; in past years I have.

8. State what in the fiscal year that has just closed? I have had nothing to do with it.

9. How long is it since you had anything to do with the purchase of clothing? Up to 1883.

10. Who has to do with it now? Col. Macpherson, he is Director of Stores.

11. As the Director of Stores he would take the orders of the Minister, as to advertising for tenders, and receiving tenders and reporting upon them? Yes.

12. Did you ever take any steps to advertise for tenders in connection with the militia clothing of the last year or two, so as to ascertain the cost and what rates you could procure? In Canada?

13. Canada or anywhere? I have asked the question at the request of the Minister, to find out what they could be got for.

14. Where? In England.

15. When? In 1887.

16. How did you ask that? By letter? Did you write a letter? Yes.

17. To whom? To Messrs. Webb & Co.

18. Who are they? They are large manufacturers of cloth and clothing.

19. Where? In London.

20. Have you that letter with you? No.

21. It is in the Department? Yes.

22. Did you get a reply? Yes.

23. Is that reply in the Department? Yes.

24. Then there was just one letter? Just one letter.

25. Is that the only place you sought information? That is, in England? That is all.

26. I have noticed the name of Dolan & Co. in former years. They used to supply certain articles. Did you make application to them? No; the application I made was not with a view to tenders. It was merely to ascertain the value of articles.

27. That is of English made articles? Yes.

28. How does English-made militia clothing compare in durability and fit and appearance with the Canadian-made, such as has been supplied within the last year or two? It is better in fit and appearance.

29. How about durability? We have not been able to test that yet. It would take some time.

30. I notice in looking through the various reports that very few of them speak favorably of our Canadian made stuff. They speak of them as "fair," "average," but they will not go beyond that. You have noticed that? Yes.

31. Would that be said of English-made stuff? I think they are liable to make poor stuff as well as anybody else.

32. Taking what you supplied and what you have got? They have worn very well and fit very well, and moreover it is what the army wear.

33. What is the average life of a well made English uniform as compared with what the Department has obtained in Canada? It is intended to be the same.

34. I know it is intended to be the same; but what is the experience by you? Experience has shown us that the articles are not so good nor so long lived. At the same time it is not necessary to expect in a new enterprise—

35. I am not asking for reasons, I am asking for results.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON—You have stopped him before he has answered the question at all.

36. I was asking for results not reasons. You will be kind enough to wait until I am through. Are you aware that there is quite a feeling of dissatisfaction among the militia of Canada in regard to the quality of the clothing now being served out? There have been a good many complaints.

37. Have they taken on any particular form? Have you heard that one of the regiments has at its own expense ordered uniforms from England? No.

38. You have not heard that? No.

39. I presume you have a good many letters in the Department from the officers of regiments in regard to the quality of the clothing? Yes. When you asked that question, there are two regiments that have ordered from England—one I think directly by the Minister himself, and one by the parties themselves, because they wear special uniforms that could not be made here. One was a Highland regiment.

40. What was the other? The Foot Guards.

41. I am speaking of ordinary infantry regiments? I am not aware of any.

42. You do not know anything about the workings of the details? Nothing whatever.

43. Would it be unreasonable to say that the life of a Canadian-made uniform as compared with an English-made uniform was as two years is to three? I would not like to say that. There are many of the articles that are made of excellent material. The difficulty has been more in the dye than anything else. The color does not stand as well. It is the peculiarity of the country.

44. What is the peculiarity of the country? The dye does not stand so well. It is either in the water or in the sun.

45. The fit is not so good? No.

46. Nor the cloth is not as good? Some of the articles are quite good, but some are not quite so good.

47. What is the relative value of the two—between the English and Canadian? I have never investigated it.

48. Are they of equal value? How do you mean?

49. I mean equal value. Supposing that they both cost the same, which would you buy if you were buying for yourself? Well, the English-made uniforms are preferred by the Canadian militia because they are the same as those worn by the English army. In the cut they are also good.

50. You say in the cut and material the English uniforms are superior to those made in Canada. Perhaps that was the reason? No.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

51. You have spoken of some complaints having been made in reference to clothing served out. Is it not a fact that some complaints were made of the clothing formerly made in England at different times? Yes.

52. You have also said that the material the clothing was made of at present was not very good. Is it not a fact that the material which enters into the manufacture of the clothing is of a better description than the material which entered into some of the clothing manufactured in England? I think I have already said that in some cases the material is good and perhaps a little better than in England.

53. More likely to last than what we usually import from England? Yes; at least the defect is in the color. That is all.

54. That is your only reason why you say it is not equal to the English. It is on account of the dyeing, which you say is not quite as perfect as the dye used in the manufacture of English goods? Where the articles are supplied according to the sealed pattern.

55. Now, Col. Powell, within your experience and mine, is it not a fact that the dyeing has improved considerably of late years? Yes.

56. It is superior to-day to what it was when we commenced having our clothing manufactured in Canada? Very greatly, especially in the scarlet.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

57. That is where the difficulty was, I think? Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Tupper:

58. Referring to the hearsay evidence—of what you heard—Mr. Mulock asked you as to complaints against Canadian clothing. Are you aware that there are complaints against the ammunition, rifles, and bayonets being investigated in England?

MR. MULOCK.—Don't let this get involved in this other matter.

HON. MR. TUPPER.—I do not think Mr. Mulock has a right to run this examination. He has examined Col. Powell as to complaints here and his point is against the Canadian clothing served out to the militia. I ask whether he has heard in the same way of complaints now being investigated, or recently investigated, in England by Parliament as to the bayonets being served out to the British army. I ask him if he is aware of that?

MR. JONES (Halifax).—That has nothing to do with it.

HON. MR. TUPPER.—In your judgment perhaps, but I submit that it may have considerable to do with this preference for goods made outside this country, seeing that in the other country you are liable at times to have a poor article served out to the troops. I submit that the question is a proper one and I am willing to submit to the ruling of the chair.

MR. MULOCK.—I asked the witness what complaints came to his department and he has said it was information based upon the complaints the consumers sent in. If all sorts of latitude be allowed and questions which are irrelevant are asked you will make this enquiry perfectly futile.

MR. LISTER.—The question has been asked Mr. Mulock.

HON. MR. TUPPER.—If Mr. Mulock will state what he intends to prove we will confine the examination to that. If Mr. Mulock will give the specific charge upon which he wishes to examine the witness, all right, but I certainly object to his right to question in his own line. These gentlemen are trying to show that the goods served out are not so good as the clothing in England, and I want to show that it does not follow because we got good articles in England before these would have been as good now, I ask the chairman's ruling on my question.

The chairman ruled that the question should be confined to clothing.

59. MR. JONES (Halifax).—I wish to ask Col. Powell, whether it was not held in the department that the English clothing would last as three to two, whether it was not known to the department that in point of quality, fit and usefulness that the English clothing was as three to two.

MR. BOWELL.—What period are you speaking of, when you were there?

MR. JONES.—Yes.

MR. MULOCK.—Canadian was two and England three.

By Mr. Jones :

60. Has there been any circumstance to bring out a change in this respect? Yes; I think so. I do not think it is at all possible to take tenders from the whole of the people of Canada. To get as good articles as you can you must get them from some special man who is a manufacturer and who had some capital and reputation at stake. I do not think it is possible to get good goods—

By S^r A. P. Caron :

61. In Canada? I mean if we take tenders over the whole country and you agree to take the lowest tender, I don't think it is possible to get good articles.

62. Practically you have to give a monopoly to these men to get a better class of goods? Yes; practically that.

63. Who are the men you give this practical monopoly to? I do not know.

64. Do you know who makes your military clothing? Yes.

65. HON. MR. BOWELL.—Do you know that any practical monopoly is given to anyone?

MR. DAVIES.—He answered that question by saying it was practically a monopoly.

66. Did you answer that or not? I do not know that it was practically a monopoly. I said I did not think it was possible to get as good an article by receiving tenders from all over the country, as, by taking one.

67. And you said that it was a monopoly? No.

By Mr. Lister :

68. When did you commence buying these articles in Canada? 1883.

69. Prior to that time they were never manufactured in Canada? Some of them were.

70. And the entire purchases are now made in Canada? Yes; with the exceptions I have stated; that in two cases where the uniforms worn were special patterns and where no person in Canada would care to take the contract for making them.

71. Is it not a fact that during the last five years you have had constant complaints from the different battalions throughout the country of the quality of the trowsers furnished to them? Yes; that is in many cases.

72. Have you not been informed by officers and others of these battalions that the trowsers only lasted a few days while out on drill? I should hardly think that. I think it is quite possible to tear a very good pair of trowsers.

73. Have not these complaints been made that the trowsers have worn out and become useless during the 14 days these battalions are out on annual drill? In some cases they have.

74. You have told the Committee that the clothing manufactured in Canada did not stand the sun and water? I said the water was in connection with the dyeing. It is the water used in the dyeing process, not the water that comes down in the rain.

75. That is, the water was not suitable for the dyeing, that it was that cause or the sun which made the quality of the dyeing inferior? I think it was the climate.

76. Then as a matter of fact you cannot get cloth here as good as the English cloth for these reasons? I would not like to say that, for I think by experience the manufacturers ought to be able to dye.

77. If the difficulty is the water or sun, that difficulty will continue. Have they, as a matter of fact, found any means of meeting these difficulties? In one or two instances they have.

78. How do you know? By actually seeing the cloth.

79. When did they overcome the difficulty? Every year there is an improvement.

80. Do you state to the Committee that every year there is an improvement so far as the character of the cloth is concerned? Yes; and dyeing.

81. You have imported none of these articles since 1883—tunics? With the exception of those of which I spoke.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

82. Will you tell me please how long you have been in the Department of Militia? I have been there 26 years.

83. Have you any recollection of any period during that whole time that you have not heard of complaints from volunteers? There are always complaints.

MR. BOWELL.—I have been for seventeen years connected with that myself, and I have had some little experience.

By Hon. Mr. Tupper:

84. You answered Mr. Jones' question a little while ago in reference to the comparative condition of the two classes of uniforms. Are you able to state what percentage of improvement there has been in Canadian clothing since the time to which you refer down to the present day? Since which time?

85. Since the time Mr. Jones referred to. What improvement has there been in the last ten years? There has been very great improvement. During the time Mr. Jones was Minister they could not manufacture good scarlet.

86. There has been a marked improvement in the Canadian article since that? Very great.

87. The causes to which Mr. Lister alluded—you do not speak of trowsers, for instance, as a rule lasting only 14 days? I think it is quite possible to spoil good as well as poor trowsers.

88. Exactly. I say that when you answered Mr. Lister and stated you had heard of trowsers lasting say from 14 to 15 days, you were speaking of the exception and not of any rule, I suppose? Yes.

89. Are you of your own knowledge aware whether the military or militia clothing similar to what we use and what we used before from England has kept up to the standard they obtained ten years ago or has fallen. Are you aware of your own knowledge? Well, I think we are going on making great progress.

90. You don't understand me. Are you aware in the case of the English uniforms or English articles for uniforms whether they have maintained the high standard alluded to of 10 years ago down to the present day. Are you aware whether they have maintained it or whether it has fallen? In England?

91. Yes? They have deteriorated.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

92. Col. Powell, you state that some complaints were made about trowsers. Is it to your knowledge that at any time within the last eight or nine years that we had to return whole shipments of English goods to England from the fact that our inspector could not pass on them? Well, I don't think there were any in whole shipments.

93. In a large quantity? There were quite a number.

94. Trowsers and tunics? No tunics. I am not aware of tunics. I know of some trowsers.

95. A large quantity I mean—not a few pairs? Well, I should think 100 pairs.

By Mr. Mulock:

96. Did you ever return any Canadian? Oh yes. It is the duty of the inspector to ascertain that all the articles he inspects are according to the sealed pattern, and whenever he finds they are not he throws them out. The contractor can take them back again or not as he chooses.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

97. Is it not a fact that the inspector inspects the cloth before? I am not aware.

98. The reason I asked you that was there was one period when I had something to do with the acceptance of tenders, and cloths were submitted I sent to the Inspector and he reported upon the cloth. I remember distinctly the lowest tender we rejected at that time. I have a distinct recollection of that. We rejected the lowest tender because the cloth was not so good and it would not last? Quite so.

By Mr. Somerville:

99. I understand you to say that all goods were not obtained by tender in Canada? I did not say that. What I said was that the plan of getting from one manufacturer was far better than taking tenders from the whole of them, because if you take the lowest tender you will not be able to get so good an article.

100. Are you aware what proportions are purchased by tender and what without tender? I believe they are all tendered for. I do not know that as a matter of course.

The Committee adjourned.

THURSDAY, 14th March, 1889.

Committee met; Mr. Rykert in the Chair.

COL. POWELL re-called and further examined.

By Mr. Mulock:

101. Yesterday you mentioned that you had sent a letter to Webb & Company, of England, asking for information about military clothing, and that you had received a reply? I did.

102. And I dropped your examination at that point. The Committee asked that a copy of that letter and the reply be produced to-day. Will you produce these papers?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—It was quite impossible for me to have any time whatever yesterday to look into the papers, which were asked for by the Committee. We were at the Committee till near one o'clock; then we had to attend the Council, and after that we went to the House. As soon as I have any time to look into the papers they will be brought down.

MR. MULOCK.—I did not expect that all the papers asked for by the Committee would be brought down to-day. I only wanted the letter mentioned and the reply.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—If that is all the hon. gentleman wants to-day, I will send and get them.

COL. POWELL.—I have them in my pocket.

By Mr. Mulock:

103. Then, why did not you produce them when I asked for them? Did you have any conversation with the Minister of Militia about this letter?

THE CHAIRMAN.—I rule that question out of order.

By Mr. Mulock:

104. Will you tell me if this cablegram is a reply to the letter you wrote to Webb & Company? Yes.

105. This letter is dated August 29th, 1887. Is it the letter you referred to? Yes; this is a copy of the cablegram.

106. You sent the letter on the 29th August, 1887—the letter, marked Exhibit “*A” to Webb & Company? Yes.

107. And the cablegram marked, Exhibit “*B”? Yes.

108. And the letter, marked Exhibit “*C”? Yes.

109. The letter refers to—? If you read this, then you will see what it refers to.

That is all I have to ask you.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

110. Under what circumstances were this letter and cablegram sent? What was the object? The object in sending the letter and the cablegram was so as to be informed of the value of military clothing in England, so as to be able to judge the value in Canada.

By Mr. Hesson :

111. Had you samples of that cloth here that you might form your opinion from your previous samples that had been in use in the department? We had, we knew perfectly well.

By Mr. Bergin :

112. Will you read from that book to show why you do not produce the letters? It simply states that no official information shall be given outside the department without the consent of the head of the department.

By Mr. Mulock :

113. Now that we have opened up this interesting question again, I hold that the witness is not now acting as a subordinate. He is acting as a witness and I want a complete reply from him. I desire to know from you, Col. Powell, if you have had any conversation with the Minister of Militia since the last meeting with reference to these letters. You are a witness now?

MR. BERGIN.—I object to the question.

THE CHAIRMAN.—The witness need not answer the question.

COL. MACPHERSON called.

By Mr. Mulock :

114. You are aware, Col. Macpherson, of the contents of these packages? Yes.

115. Have there been any additions to them since yesterday? No.

116. That is the advertisement of August, 1886, the advertisement for tenders? Yes.

117. That was the advertisement issued in 1886? Yes.

118. That is marked exhibit “*D”? Yes.

119. That was the only advertisement in 1886 for tenders to the Supply Department for clothing? Yes.

120. In 1887 you appear to have adopted a different practice, namely of sending a circular letter to the parties? Yes.

121. You did that instead of advertising? Yes.

122. There is a copy of that letter here. This is a copy of it I believe, marked Exhibit “*E”? Yes.

123. Exhibit “*E” is a letter dated 6th August, 1887, from Col. Panet? Yes.

124. Annexed to that is a schedule showing the descriptions of the articles? Yes.

125. Exhibit “*E” and the schedule comprise the circular sent to the manufacturers in August, 1887? Yes.

126. That was the only notice issued that year for tenders? Yes, for clothing.

127. To whom was this circular letter sent?

Mr. TAYLOR.—I ask that the letters handed in by Col. Powell be read.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—These were the letters they say we wanted to suppress. [The letters were then read, see exhibits “*F and *G”.]

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

128. I would like to ask whether the Minister of Militia entered into a contract for three years without tendering? We did not advertise, we entered into a contract after sending a circular around.

By Mr. Mulock :

129. To whom was this circular of August 6th, 1887, sent? To four firms; H. Shorey & Co., W. E. Sanford & Co., Hamilton, James O'Brien & Co., Montreal, and Doull & Miller, Halifax.

130. These are the four to whom that circular was sent? Yes.

131. To no one else? To no one else.

132. When? On the 6th of August, 1887.

133. Did the department ever advertise or invite tenders subsequently? Not for clothing.

134. For no kind of clothing in connection with the service? For no kind of clothing in connection with the service.

135. These are the only tenders, then. The advertisement of August, 1886, and the circular letter of August, 1887, are the only invitations for tender either through the post office or otherwise that the department issued? Yes.

136. When were tenders put in in reply to this circular invitation? At various dates. Some of them arrived immediately, while others did not arrive for a week or two. Some waited for some time and then we urged them to send in their tender.

137. Up to what time did you issue contracts based upon the tenders asked for by this circular letter? I think one of the last tenders was dated sometime in November or December.

138. They were all in in the year 1887? Yes.

139. The contracts entered into in consequence of the offers made after this circular were entered into in 1887? In 1887, with the exception of Doull & Miller; it was in 1888, as there was some correspondence respecting the tunics.

140. Have you samples of cloth sent from England? I am not quite sure that I have any now; we had some some years ago, but we have not had any samples from England since we advertised.

141. Did samples of cloth come with that letter or cable in consequence of that cable message from Webb & Co. I am not quite sure. Col. Powell may be able to say. The letter did not come through me.

COL. POWELL.—We received none.

142. Have you received in your department any communications from any military men in Canada in reference to the militia clothing supplied by the department? Yes. I think there were two or three letters received in my office, but any correspondence of that nature would come first to the Adjutant General, but I think I have one or two letters.

143. Who has charge? They would naturally come from the Adjutant General and then to the Minister.

By Mr. Bowell :

144. Would you give the Committee the reasons, if you had any, for changing this system? When we advertised in 1886 there were four or five contractors who tendered for clothing that year, and I think it was thought desirable to save the expenses of advertising and merely to circularize these contractors of the previous year to send in tenders for the next year's supply. It was thought desirable in the interest of economy, and besides that the contractors of the previous year or two had got into the groove of producing the articles to suit the department and it would save us a great deal of trouble not to make contracts with new tenderers. That was one of the objects in coming to an arrangement of this kind.

145. Did you from your practical experience of the past make such a recommendation to the Minister? Yes; I joined with Col. Panet on the subject, recommending that it would be desirable to continue the same contractors, as it would save the department a great deal of trouble and expense.

146. Have you found it advantageous? I think so.

147. You so reported to your Minister in writing? I am not sure that I made a special report upon the subject, except this joint report of Col. Panet and myself.

By Mr. Lister :

148. Then so far as the contracts are concerned, they were entered into in 1886 and 1887, and nothing but this circular letter indicated to them that the department required military clothing? Nothing.

149. I see that four parties tendered for the furnishing of supplies? For different lines of clothing.

150. Four parties offered for different lines of clothing in pursuance of the circular sent to each one? There was W. E. Sanford of Hamilton, James O'Brien of Montreal, Shorey & Co. of Montreal, and Doull & Miller of Halifax. Now in the circular you wrote giving a list of the clothing you required, there was nothing said about overcoats? No.

151. Did you write a circular to each of these people asking them to make an offer to the department for the supply of such greatcoats as you required? No; we did not.

152. Then I understand from you that the four persons who were written to, made offers to the department for certain portions of the clothing that the department required? Yes.

153. But as a matter of fact the clothing required by the department to be made in accordance with these circulars was furnished by only three of the people offering? Yes.

154. That is a matter of fact. Why was it that James O'Brien, one of the persons offering was not given a contract along with the rest? He had been the contractor for the three previous years. That firm tendered for the supply of greatcoats.

155. But it was not greatcoats you were asking for. Why was it that no portion of the goods required in the circular written was awarded to James O'Brien? Their prices were higher.

156. Is that the reason? That was the reason.

157. The only reason? Their prices were far in advance of all the other tenderers.

158. Was that the only reason? As far as I am aware of.

159. Did you have any correspondence with James O'Brien & Co., indicating why it was that their tender was not accepted along with the others? There was no correspondence.

160. Then you did not inform James O'Brien & Co. that they were not allowed to participate in these contracts, because their prices were higher than the others? I did not inform them.

161. You just awarded the contract to the other three? Yes.

162. Will you tell me whether the values were about equal so far as the other three were concerned? They were different lines of clothing.

163. I mean the total amount paid to the other three? I can give you the figures.

164. What is your impression? I cannot say without referring to the figures.

165. Just speaking roughly, would the amount paid James O'Brien, Shorey & Co. and Sanford & Co. be about equal? I cannot say without referring to the accounts.

166. I understood you to say you never informed James O'Brien & Co. that their offer was refused by the department because it was higher than the offers of the others? I never informed him.

167. As a matter of fact, was it higher? Yes.

168. In all respects, taking the whole thing together? Yes.

169. And that was the reason? That was the reason.

170. Did you award James O'Brien the contract for the greatcoats? Yes.

171. That was another circular letter written to the parties? Not with regard to greatcoats.

172. Will you tell the Committee the total amount paid to James O'Brien for greatcoats that year? \$18,597.50.

173. You cannot inform the Committee what the total amount was that was paid to the other parties? Yes.

174. Do that? Shorey & Co., \$18,900; Doull & Miller, \$15,855; Sanford Manufacturing Co., \$50,563.75.

175. These were the amounts paid to these three parties? For the fiscal year ending the 30th of June last.

176. When was it in the first place that the department made up its mind that an application should be made to manufacturers for greatcoats? We commenced the supply of greatcoats in 1883. We did not circularize for greatcoats.

177. This year? We did not send circulars for greatcoats this year.

178. When did you send them? I cannot say precisely.

179. It was not at the time you issued the circulars? I cannot say.

180. What is the date of Shorey & Co's? The 6th August, 1887, \$18,900.

THE CHAIRMAN—The amount of O'Brien & Co's is \$16,475 and Shorey & Co's \$18,900.

By Mr. Lister :

181. On the 6th August the circular was sent to these people? Yes.

182. Did I understand you to say at that time the department had not asked for tenders for greatcoats? There was no reference made to greatcoats.

183. Will you tell the Committee at what time the decision was come to about the greatcoats? I mentioned the 23rd August, the Order in Council is dated the 5th August. [See Exhibits "H," "J," "K," and "L".]

SIB ADOLPHE CARON—Will you read the report which is annexed? It is not annexed.

By Mr. Lister :

184. The date of the Order in Council is August 5. It was decided that the contract of O'Brien & Company should be extended? Yes; the original contract was entered into 1883.

185. At that time it was extended three years? Yes.

186. At the old prices? At the same prices.

187. Had you any correspondence with James O'Brien & Co. previous to that Order in Council? I am not aware.

188. Was there any within your knowledge? None that I am aware of.

189. Did you have any correspondence with James O'Brien & Co. after the passing of that Order in Council? Very likely. I could not say without reference to my letter book. I am quite sure there was correspondence.

190. Was there correspondence to inform James O'Brien & Co. of this Order in Council? I cannot say positively.

191. Did you write to James O'Brien & Co. about the Order in Council? I think so.

192. If you did it would be informing them that such an Order in Council had been passed? I think so.

193. On the 5th August, 1887, without asking for tenders from any manufacturers in Canada or England, you informed James O'Brien & Co. that they were to have the contract for three years more at the same price that had been paid to them before? They submitted a tender as to price.

194. At the same price paid to them previously? Yes, I would not be positive about the price paid in 1883 without reference to my papers to find the prices paid in the previous year.

195. Did you have any other offers from Canadian manufacturers or from Great Britain? Not that I am aware of.

196. Did you take any steps to ascertain if greatcoats would be furnished by other firms? No.

197. Then the contract with James O'Brien and Co. was entered into without tenders from any other firm? Yes.

198. I suppose you are familiar with the quality of military clothing? To some extent.

199. How long have you been in the service? Since 1862—the last 16 years at headquarters.

200. Have you been familiar with the purchase of clothing since then? The last three or four years.

201. Are you familiar with the quality? To some extent. I would not place any confidence in my opinion.

202. Would you give an opinion as to the quality of Canadian clothing? We have our inspector upon whose opinion we base our judgment.

203. Who is the inspector? Mr. R. Watson, of Ottawa.

204. Now, will you look at this letter, the first article is for artillery tunics. This is the same as you asked tenders for? Yes.

205. These are artillery tunics. Are they the same as mentioned in the circular? Yes.

206. Artillery serge tunics. Is that the same? Yes.

207. You have no trowsers? No; we have no trowsers.

208. Infantry tunics? Infantry cloth tunics.

209. Is that the same? Yes.

210. Military tunics, serge? Same.

211. Rifle tunics, cloth rifle tunics? The same.

212. Tunics, rifle, serge? The same.

By Mr. Mulock:

213. The whole lot so far as it goes is the same as you asked for in the circular? As far as it goes. It does not include everything.

214. All they tendered for, mentioned in the letter 16th September, 1887, in the correspondence, are the same kind of articles as you got in these contracts with Doull, Miller & Co., and Sanford & Co.? Yes.

By Mr. Lister:

215. There is one thing I observed the other day in the House. I suppose there has been a great shrinkage in values within the last two or three years? I am not aware.

216. It was so stated in the House the other day?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON—It is much higher.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

217. Did any officers in charge of the contracting write to the Minister with reference to these greatcoats, with reference to tendering? Yes.

218. Have you that report with you? No.

219. Would that contain reasons for continuing? Yes.

220. Do you recollect the reasons, as we have not got the report here? We can get the document.

COL. POWELL recalled and further examined.

By Mr. Mulock:

221. This letter which you put in to-day speaks of the cost in England and I want to ask what will have to be added to the English cost to lay the goods down in Canada. These are prices in England delivered in London? Yes.

222. What would you have to add to those prices in order to lay those goods down in Canada? About five per cent.

223. That would include all charges? Yes, about five per cent.

224. Freight, packing and everything else? Yes.

225. Add five per cent. to the sterling price mentioned in the letter and you will have the cost laid down? Yes.

226. Insurance too? Yes, everything.

HON. MR. BOWELL.—I object to this account being laid before this Committee, because I think we shall be departing from the practice of the past. The only accounts before this Committee are the accounts for the past year, and if we are to investigate the accounts of 1883, it will not be carrying out the practice of this

Committee. I think you will admit that if we do not observe the practice, we shall be opening the door for the investigation of accounts for the past 20 years.

THE CHAIRMAN.—We have no such power here. If Mr. Mulock desires the accounts for 1883, he should make a report to the House asking to have those accounts laid before the Committee.

After further discussion of the method of procedure, the hearing of evidence was adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM, 20th March, 1889.

Committee met; Mr. Rykert in the Chair.

Mr. WATSON called and examined.

By Sir Adolphe Caron.

227. Mr. Watson, you are inspector of clothing, are you not? Yes.

228. Will you state to the Committee if you have samples of the clothing which were issued in 1888 and 1887? I have got a sample of the sealed patterns, English clothing, and I have also a sample of the different lines of clothing that have been received during the past year.

229. Will you produce these samples? I will.

230. Will you tell what experience you have had in judging of clothing and material. I will repeat the question. I wish you to state to the committee what experience you have had in the judging of clothing and the material which enters into the manufacture of the clothing which you have just produced? I have had an experience of 25 years of constant work and practice.

231. You consider yourself an expert? I do.

232. In such matters? Yes.

233. Will you produce the sample which you now have, and will you state to the Committee what your opinion is as to the quality between the English pattern—the sealed English pattern—you have spoken of, and the goods manufactured in Canada? I would like to place the English and Canadian side by side, so that I can take one up after the other. We will take up the first line, the principal item of expenditure—scarlet tunics. Here is the Canadian and here is the English sealed pattern from which the goods were made. Here is a sample of the goods in the piece.

234. Will you state what your opinion is about that sample, as to the quality, color and everything connected with it? I contend that the Canadian goods is the purest stock. It is made from absolutely pure stock. The other is not.

235. Then you consider the Canadian cloth superior to the one which is used in the sealed pattern—the English sealed pattern—which you produce? Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

236. Would you consider it, considering the value of the cloth, the cheapest to buy? Value considered—I do not know the price of either; but I know that the Canadian goods are very much better goods.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

237. Do you refer chiefly to scarlet tunics? I take all the lines.

238. What about color? It is cochineal, the fastest dye known in scarlet. Looking at the make of the tunics, I consider that the make of the Canadian is very much superior to the English. The value of these goods does not lie altogether in the material, but in the making as well. I contend that the make of the Canadian is very much superior to the English.

239. Which is the English? You will see the mark on the tab. I think the Canadian make is very much superior to that of English.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

240. The make and material of the Canadian you consider superior to the English? I consider so. Yes.

241. I wish now to examine Mr. Watson about the other tunics. If any hon. gentleman chooses to put any question in reference to the scarlet tunics I think it will save time to do so now.

By Mr. McMullen :

242. I was going to draw his attention to the linings, to the kind of linings which were put in at the time these goods were made up? Which linings?

243. Regarding the sleeve linings? The sealed pattern governs that. We do not make the specification for every little part of trimmings. The sealed pattern governs the goods to be supplied.

244. These goods are intended to be worn a long time. The outside material seems to be good and a person would suppose it would wear for a long time, but when you look at the linings, no person manufacturing would put material of that kind in when the goods were wanted for wear? How can we get over this English sealed pattern. It is not a matter of choice. It is a matter of necessity. This is the sample we have to give to them.

Mr. MULOCK.—If you expect me to cross examine on each separate article it will take some time.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

245. Mr. Watson, will you explain to the Committee what your opinion is about that artillery tunic as to the material and make as compared with the English sample? The same refers to the artillery, with this exception: I contend that the Canadian-made goods are the purest. The goods are made from purer stock; not perhaps absolutely free from shoddy, but the face finish has not been quite as good. These goods are known as face finished goods and the scarlet finished goods are finished as meltons. Our manufacturers were unable to get quite as good a finish. They are sheared either a little too close, or a little too woolly. The stock is decidedly better.

246. And the finish this year? The finish has improved very much this year, and in fact I consider the supply this year quite as good as the English. I have reported to the department that we have had a difficulty with the finish. That is the only objection I think. The dye is pure indigo.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

247. You know nothing about the prices? I know nothing about the prices. I never saw an invoice or a contract.

248. You simply speak as to the quality? That is all. My duty is to see that we get goods according to samples.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

249. Mr. Watson, that finish you speak of, which you say is not quite as perfect as the English—? I say that was our difficulty, but at this present year they have overcome that difficulty.

250. The issue this year is fully equal to the English one? I think it is superior to the sample, as far as the quality of the goods is concerned.

By the Chairman :

251. How about the finish, too? The general make up?

By Hon. Mr. Tupper :

252. You are speaking of the face finish? I say they have overcome the difficulty of finishing the cloth, and Canadian finished cloth is this year equal to the English.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

253. As inspector, will you explain to the Committee what your duty is when the goods are sent into our stores; what you have to do; what is done as to the judging of the quality; and if you decide that the goods are not what they ought to be, what occurs under these circumstances? Well, I may say that these sealed patterns are constantly before me. The goods arrive and I at once proceed to examine them. I have a means of testing the dyes by chemicals as well as the dry test. It is an absolute test as to whether they are indigo or not. As to testing whether the goods are strong, when there is a difficulty arises in my mind, I take the sample, and I

have provided myself with what is called a testing machine, the only one in Canada I know of to-day. That machine indicates to a point which of the two cloths will be the strongest. I am not likely to be deceived in that. I have only got that instrument within the last year. That is one of the provisions I have for testing any flaw in the cloth.

254. I understand you submit the samples which you produce here to that test of clothing which comes in? Samples only. Of course I get samples of the material forwarded to me; I have asked that a small piece be left on one of the garments out of every 25 pairs of trowsers, so I can use that to test them without destroying a pair of trowsers.

255. Have you produced a sample of the overcoats? I have. Yes, I will just bring it up. This is a sample of the English infantry overcoat.

256. This is from the English sample? That is the English sample of the infantry overcoat, and the other is the Canadian.

257. Will you state to the Committee your opinion as to the quality of the Canadian as compared with the English coat? What is the question?

258. I want you to express your opinion as to the relative value of these two coats as to the quality of the stuff? I think there is no comparison as to the value.

259. Which are you alluding to now? The Canadian are immensely superior. The Canadian is far superior.

MR. HANSON.—I say that it is worth 25 per cent. more. I mean the Canadian.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

260. About the trowsers: will you produce the samples? I have samples here. You will find every one marked on the tab the year they were made in.

261. Have you got samples of the cavalry and infantry trowsers? Just state to the Committee your opinion as to the relative value of the English and Canadian-made trowsers? That is Canadian. I say the material in that is absolutely pure wool. The other is at least thirty-three and a third per cent. shoddy.

262. That is the English? Yes.

263. The Canadian would be the superior article? Yes, certainly.

264. Would it last better? Oh yes; there is no question about that. We have proved it.

265. Let us take the cavalry and the infantry trowsers, and just make a statement, Mr. Watson, as to how they compare with the English samples? That is the cavalry trowsers (holding up sample).

266. Will you state what your opinion is as to the value, the relative value, of the English and Canadian samples which you now produce? This is made from pure stock, pure wool, and the English in this case is very largely made up of shoddy.

267. Well, then, of course, the Canadian article, according to your statement, is a superior article to the English? I contend that they are made of better stock.

268. And last better and are more valuable, are they? I consider they are more valuable.

269. Are you aware that any complaints have been made about the clothing at any time? Yes.

270. How do you account for those complaints? The complaint has been made about one line of infantry serge trowsers, and I could explain how that comes; when the samples of the goods were received, I submitted them to certain tests and found them correct. The contractors were instructed to go on, and I tested a few pairs here and there as I thought it necessary, and sometime during the delivery of that contract there were a few pairs that eventually proved to be defective in the warp. I may say, and anyone in the trade will know, that it is very difficult to get at the warp. You have to destroy the goods to get at it—the warp running the length of the material is covered with the wool. That of course you cannot get at to tell whether it was good or defective without destroying the material. It was proved that these trowsers were made of a defective warp, and as soon as detected it was at once remedied.

The trouble is that these were put into stock, and I cannot find a pair of trowsers with this defective warp, without tearing them.

271. Who were these manufactured by? Shorey & Co. of Montreal, and the artillery portion by Doull & Gibson, of Halifax.

By Mr. Mulock:

272. What year was that? 1887. Of course there might be some of that issue in stock yet.

By Mr. Bowell:

273. To sum it all up, do I understand you to say that the cloth out of which the clothing has of late years been made is superior in texture and every respect to that of the English; that the manufacture of them here is better done, and that they were made from samples sent to the contractors in this country? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock:

274. Do you inspect the militia clothing issued for all branches of the service in Canada? I handle every garment that is issued.

275. Do you say that the dye in the scarlet, the Canadian dye in the scarlet uniforms, is equal to that in the English uniforms issued to the regular army? Well, I contend that the dye—

275½. Do you say so or do you not? I don't know what is issued to the English army. I contend that the dye in the cloth we receive is as good as the sample I got.

276. If you do not know what is issued in the English service, how do you compare Canadian with English cloth? The fact that we hold English sealed samples. These are the goods I have shown you

277. You are unable to say then whether the dye of the scarlet cloth is or is not superior in durability than that used in the British service? The dye of the Canadian cloth?

278. Yes? I say it is as good as the sample I got.

279. When we compare the cloths issued in the English service and the cloth made in Canada and the dye in Canada, are you able to give any opinion as to the relative durability of the dye and the relative qualities in various ways? The only means I have is my own knowledge of the goods as compared with the goods submitted for my approval.

280. Before they are issued to the service? I do not know what they issue in England.

281. You base your opinion as regards the cloth and everything else by comparison of articles when they are new and in your hands before they are issued to the service? Yes.

282. So, as to durability, that is something you can only know from hearsay from others? In strength?

283. Strength and durability? I test the strength of every goods before the goods go out. Every line is subjected to the machine test.

284. Are you aware that there have been considerable complaints from the various branches of the service, extending over some years, as to the durability of the militia clothing? I am not aware of anything with the exception of these articles I have mentioned. There has also been complaints of the same goods from the artillery.

285. Are you aware that there are pretty general complaints in Canada, that the scarlet, or Canadian manufactured scarlet cloth, loses its color, gets discolored very shortly after exposure, and that it does not stand its color at all compared with the English scarlet? I am not aware of that.

286. You say that the overcoats manufactured by James O'Brien & Co. of Montreal, are all pure, while the others have more or less shoddy in them. What do you say about James O'Brien & Co.'s overcoats? I say it is very much purer than the English.

287. What do you mean by much purer? I say there is perhaps 90 per cent. pure stock and 10 per cent. shoddy in the Canadian, while there is 60 per cent. shoddy in the English and 40 per cent. wool.

288. Are you aware that the Canadian overcoat is much heavier than the English? Yes.

289. Do you know the relative weights of the two overcoats? I don't know exactly the weight. I am not sure as to the weight.

290. They are too heavy. Do you know how that is accounted for? By the weight of the cloth.

291. Not altogether the cloth. Are you aware that in the Canadian overcoat cloth, waste is largely used? That is shoddy.

292. You call waste, shoddy? Yes.

293. I think, with all respect to you, I think otherwise. My own impression is that shoddy and waste are two distinct things? You may call them different, but they are completely the same things.

294. I understand waste to be this: The clippings off the ends and surface of cloth, is swept up, made very fine and forced by pressure into the warp of the cloth as it is being manufactured? It cannot be done in that way.

295. We will find out. I understand that shoddy is where cloth is torn to pieces and the short is worked up with the wool and so spun, and finally worked into the cloth? The waste is used in the same way.

296. You do not know the difference between waste and shoddy? They are very much the same thing.

297. You think that? Yes.

298. You recognize no material difference between waste and shoddy? I think they are both equally durable.

299. You do not know that waste means fine wool clippings that is just filled in to the cloth during the process of manufacture, while shoddy is cloth that has been torn to pieces and reduced almost to wool and worked up with long wool. You do not recognize the difference? It is very much the same thing. Waste is used in the same way.

300. You have found that out now? It has the same effect on the garment.

301. Are you aware that what I call waste—and I have explained what I call waste, not shoddy—is used to a considerable extent in the manufacture of the cloth used by James O'Brien & Co. in the manufacture of the overcoats? It is to a small extent.

302. Are you aware that waste is not used in the English cloth? I am not.

303. Do you know whether it is or not? I know that the English cloth is weighted at least 25 per cent. more than the Canadian.

304. Do you know which cloth is least impervious to wind, which would keep out wind better, the English overcoat cloth or the Canadian overcoat cloth, after being worn a short time? I should judge the goods from the make and water proofing they get. I may say further that I have this very line of goods here. I have made a bag of them and after hanging it up to the ceiling with a pail of water in it for eight days and nights, the water has not come through. It would not have done so for weeks.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

305. Is that the Canadian? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock:

306. Are you aware that waste enters largely into the composition of the Canadian cloth and not the English? I am not aware.

307. Are you aware of the relative weights of English overcoats and Canadian overcoats? Well, I am not very sure what are the weights; but I think the Canadian is the heavier.

308. Do you know how much heavier? That may be very largely accounted for by the fact that they are made larger.

309. But taking the same size? But they are not made the same size. Our coats are larger and wider.

310. What is the difference in weight between the two? Do you know the weight of the Canadian overcoat? I think they are about 6½ lbs. Do you mean the infantry?

311. Select what you like? $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. for the infantry.

312. Take the English infantry overcoat, what would that weigh? Very much the same thing.

313. Substantially the same weight? Very much the same.

314. Well, what would you think the material difference in the weight between the two garments would be when you say they are very much of the same weight and that the Canadian overcoat weighs six and a half pounds? Probably the English would weigh six.

315. So your idea about the difference in the weight is that the English would weigh about a half a pound less than the Canadian? You may be right. I am not saying you are wrong. I do not speak from having weighed them lately. I have not handled any lately.

316. Are you aware that, when on active service, our Canadian overcoats, after being worn a short time, allowed the wind to pass through them so as to cause great inconvenience to the wearers? I never heard that.

317. You never heard that complaint made by the volunteers who served in the North-West? No.

318. Are you aware that the texture in the English overcoat cloth is much closer than that of the Canadian? Yes; I am aware of that.

319. Are you aware that the spaces in the Canadian cloth are filled with waste, whilst in the English cloth it is not the case, the interstices being much smaller? I am aware of that.

320. What do you think the Canadian interstices are filled with? I consider that there is a small percentage of shoddy.

321. Will you tell me how that shoddy is incorporated with the cloth? It goes through the same process as the wool. It is woven in instead of the pure wool. It is very much more heavily weighted, and heavily weighted cloth will appear firmer than the pure wool.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

322. Will you explain how it is weighted? It is weighted with a substance known in the trade to manufacturers as pulp.

323. It is made from a mineral, is it not? We have a sample of it. Anyone can see what it is.

By Mr. Mulock:

324. I think you said you knew nothing about the relative prices? I do not know anything about the prices.

325. What is your opinion as to the durability, the relative durability, of the Canadian-made uniforms and the English-made uniforms? I think the Canadian ought to stand the longest.

326. You have said so before. I wanted to see whether you are sticking to that? From my knowledge of the goods I should say the Canadian would stand the longest.

327. Is that opinion based upon experience, or a mere surmise from looking at the goods in your hands? Based upon my knowledge of the goods.

328. Not from the result of experience. That is not upon the result of experience? Experience in handling the stuff.

329. Looking at the two articles before you? From my knowledge of the goods I have no hesitation in pronouncing that so.

330. Supposing some one would tell you that you were wrong and the English was more durable than the Canadian? If he was a reputable man I would probably take his opinion.

331. Supposing a good many thousand people in Canada would say that, would you change your mind? I might ask how many thousand more were on the other side.

332. Are you not aware that the department themselves are of opinion that the English is more durable than the Canadian? No; I am not aware of that.

333. You are not aware that the department think so. I think Col. Powell stated that the Canadian was not nearly so durable as the English. If he did say that would you agree with him? That would be his opinion.

334. Who is in a better position to know how it has worn, you or Col. Powell? He gets the reports that they are worn. Whose opinion would you take?

335. HON. MR. TUPPER.—Is that looks or durability?

By Mr. Mulock :

336. Durability. If Col. Powell told you the experience of the department was that the Canadian was not as durable as the English, what would you think? It would shake your confidence in your opinion? I am pretty well satisfied. I am satisfied I am right or I would not have made the reports I have.

337. I just look for a second at the report book—the annual report of the Militia and Defence for 1888. I suppose the militia clothing issued to the Royal School of Artillery at Kingston passes through your hands for inspection? Yes.

338. Are you aware that Lieut.-Col Cotton has expressed himself dissatisfied with that clothing? I am.

339. What was the nature of the complaint? They got some of these trowers that I spoke of that proved defective in the warp—and they were certainly not good—and he complained. Some of the tunics that he got were too woolly; that is, the finish of the cloth was not satisfactory. These matters were made the subject of inquiry.

340. Will it be here in the papers?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON—I suppose so.

341. MR. MULOCK—Will it be here, Col. Panet?

COL. PANET—It is.

342. MR. MULOCK—And Col. Montizambert and Holmes, are they also here?

COL. PANET—I think so.

343. A number of complaints have been made in the annual report; I suppose you have seen those? The reports have always come to me for explanation, and I have answered every one as they have come.

344. To whom did you reply? I addressed the director of stores.

345. Who is that? Col. Macpherson.

346. MR. MULOCK—Col. Macpherson, have you brought Mr. Watson's communications? Are they here?

COL. MACPHERSON—I brought no reports of the inspector on this subject.

347. MR. MULOCK—You have them?

COL. MACPHERSON—Yes.

348. MR. MULOCK—Mr. Chairman, I would ask that they be produced. Is there any objection?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON—No.

MR. MULOCK—Col. Cotton says "the clothing and boots are still unsatisfactory." I suppose this is a repetition of previous complaints. If not unreasonable, I would like to have Col. Cotton's complaints from the time they began until the present time.

By Mr. Hesson :

349. Are complaints more numerous now than formerly. I understand you have been a long time in this position, and I suppose it is not unusual to receive complaints in the department as to the want of satisfaction in the wear of clothing. Say at the time when the militia were served with English clothing altogether, were they not made—that is the English clothing—at larger expense? During my experience of 10 years—

By Mr. Mulock :

350. I will follow that up. I will now take the coats in question. Will you tell me how the Canadian coat compares with the English coats? Quite as good.

351. Do you think the Canadian fits as well? Quite as well.

352. And in that regard gives as good satisfaction as the English? Yes.

353. Are you aware that any of the officers have become so dissatisfied—or from reasons of dissatisfaction have ordered at their own expense English uniforms, rather than accept free such as are served by the department? I am not aware.

354. You have never heard that statement? There is a rumor of something of the kind; but I know nothing definite.

355. You have heard of it? I have heard that they were going to do so; but I have not heard that they did.

356. What volunteers have you heard about? Some Toronto regiment.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

357. There is a good deal said about shoddy. If I understand, waste is clippings or short ends from the manufacture of new cloth. That is superior to what I assume ordinary shoddy to be, which is old clothes picked to pieces and after going through some process is mixed with the wool in the manufacture of the cloth. It is only a question then of how much is put in? I have seen the process of making shoddy in Lancashire. They had a pile of new and old clothing and they were dumped into the same hopper and ground up.

By Mr. Hesson:

358. I desire to ask Mr. Watson again the question I asked him before, and I desire his answer to be taken down. Have the complaints made been more numerous within the past few years, or since the time Canadian clothing has been furnished to the troops, than when the supplies were from the English maker?

Mr. MULOCK.—The complaints did not come to him.

359. He says they did. Are you prepared to answer that question? Yes.

360. What do you say? We had more complaints in the years 1885 and 1886 probably than any year. That was the year we commenced to make. We have had fewer complaints lately than two or three years ago.

361. How does that compare with the time preceding the supply from Canada? Are they less numerous now? I do not know that they are.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM, 28th March, 1889.

Committee met; Mr J. C. Rykert in the Chair.

Capt. BENNETT, Toronto, called and examined.

By Mr. Mulock:

362. You are an officer of the Queen's Own, I believe? Yes.

363. Queen's Own Rifles, No. 2? Yes.

364. Headquarters at Toronto? Yes.

365. How long have you been in that force? Since the spring of 1877.

366. In what position were you at first; a full private? A full private.

367. How long were you a private? Two years. About two years.

368. And then you were promoted to what rank? Corporal, and then sergeant and lieutenant.

369. When did you become a lieutenant? I do not remember the exact date. About five years ago I became a commissioned officer.

370. Now you are a captain in the service? Yes.

371. How long have you been a captain in the regiment? Two years this spring.

372. I stated to this Committee last week that there was dissatisfaction in the Queen's Own in regard to the character of the uniforms issued by the department; I have been so informed; surely that is not the case? There has been great dissatisfaction amongst the officers and men for the last five or six years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—Before this question is gone into I should like to submit to you as Chairman of this Committee whether the dissatisfaction existing in the Queen's Own or any other battalion is a matter which should come before this Committee of Public Accounts for investigation. As I understand it, the functions of this Committee are to help the Government in looking into the expenditure of public money. It seems to me whatever dissatisfaction may exist in the militia

force, or out of the militia force, is not a proper subject for investigation in this Committee. My reason for objecting is because if these questions are investigated by the Committee on Public Accounts it seems to me it will not be possible to get through the work which properly comes before this Committee. The whole of our time will be taken up by the investigation of matters quite foreign to the Committee of Public Accounts.

MR. MULOCK.—I charge that in this particular case, in the matter of the issue of uniforms by the Department of Militia, the Government has made improvident bargains, has issued without tender at unreasonable prices, and that in the purchase of certain material has not got value for the money. We are now investigating accounts for this material, and the enquiry is to show that the money that we expended last year for militia clothing was expended without regard to sound principles, not having advertised for contracts for the supply, and that the supply was of an inferior character and that the country has suffered. The work has been so inferior in cut and dye, that the regiment to which I refer has decided to throw back upon the Government the issue of uniforms made at the public expense, and buy, out of the pockets of the men themselves, proper uniforms. That is the character of the evidence which I propose to prove, and when I have done with the Queen's Own in that regard I propose to take up some other regiments.

SIR ADOLPHE P. CARON.—Providing it is allowed.

MR. MULOCK.—I have told you what I propose to prove.

MR. MCCARTHY.—Surely that is not the intention of this Committee, this Committee of Public Accounts, the object of which is to see that payments have been properly made upon contracts properly entered into; as to whether there are good contracts or bad contracts and whether the result is satisfactory or unsatisfactory, it is a matter of proper enquiry by the Committee. The question here is whether the money has been paid upon the contract entered into or if the material was received and paid for. That appears to be the function of the Committee. The matter which the hon. gentleman proposes to bring forward, it would appear to me, ought to be a subject for investigation by a Special Committee.

MR. MULOCK.—The hon. member for Simcoe says the functions of this Committee are to enter into an inquiry respecting the contracts duly entered into. I stated that there have been contracts entered into by the Militia Department that were not duly entered into. In my judgment—and I may be entirely wrong, but I think it is a fair position to take—contracts of the nature now before the Committee should never have been entered into. They are improvident contracts; they are contracts given without open tender. They were in some cases contracts without tender of any kind. They were contracts given to political favorites and the tenderers formed a ring and succeeded in there being no competition, in fact, at all. In that way I believe 66 per cent. of the expenditure of public money—or as 100 is to 167—has been wasted. It will be the duty of this Committee, if what I allege is true, to make a special report of that character to the House. Before we can say that the public money has been improperly expended; before we can say that the \$60,000 or \$70,000 paid for uniforms has been properly paid or not, it is the duty of the Committee to investigate the charges which I make against the department. We cannot say that the money has been improperly expended unless you allow me to prove the irregularities and departures from all sound principles of expending public money. That, I say, the documents before us prove, and the witness here, I am told, will establish. If, however, the Committee rules otherwise, the inquiry is at an end. I make a grave charge, and I am prepared to establish it or take the consequences. I charge the Minister of Militia, having control of the public interest, with having issued contracts for the supply of militia clothing at improvident prices to political favorites; and that he did not exercise, or his department did not exercise, proper supervision over the material supplied, and as a result many of the battalions in this country are to-day in a demoralized condition. Many of the volunteers of the country have left the service owing to the matters I complain of. One regiment, as good and loyal as ever wore Her Majesty's uniform, is in a condition of

chronic disaffection owing to the uniforms. Several men have left the regiment because they would not serve under such conditions. These are the reasons I make these charges—partly covered by the matters we have before us now and partly covered by the events of years gone by.

MR. MCCARTHY—As far as I am concerned, I only object to this extent: I think it is quite proper to enquire whether this contract was let by tender or not. I object to an enquiry such as he speaks of, as to whether the material furnished was satisfactory or not. Surely the Public Accounts Committee should only deal with the question: was there a contract? Was that contract entered into according to the law or usages of the department or in the interests of the public service? If under that contract the money became due, it must be paid. If paid, it must have been properly paid. Surely that is all the Public Accounts Committee has to do. If the hon. gentleman has serious charges to make, it is extraordinary that he did not bring them forward in the House, when a Committee could have been appointed in due form. The question as to whether dissatisfaction does not prevail in the militia would of course be outside of the objects of this Committee.

MR. MULOCK—This was first spoken of on the 28th of March, and this Committee has been in session for several weeks. This point was raised over and over again, and this point should have been taken before this witness was subpoenaed, if there was anything in it. I do not complain of his coming in at the eleventh hour to attend to his public duties. I submit to the ruling of the Chairman of course, as I always do. I submit that the House ought to be informed on this point. The evidence is material, and I ask now that the Committee permit me to continue the enquiry anyway. We began it according to the ruling of the Committee. The Committee ruled in favor of allowing this enquiry to proceed, because at the last meeting I was asked what the witnesses would prove, and I said then substantially, what I said to-day. Is that not your recollection, Mr. Chairman? Did I not, when the Minister of Marine asked me what those witnesses were to prove, produce some correspondence which I had received from different persons, officers in the service, but not from Capt. Bennett whom I had never met in my life, until he was subpoenaed before this Committee? I said in substance what evidence would be supplied, and the Committee assented to the proposition, and assented to the position I had taken by directing that these witnesses should be subpoenaed to-day. Therefore we already have the ruling of the Committee on this point. If it has to be ruled over again, let it be ruled.

The **CHAIRMAN**.—As I understand, the accounts are referred to us for investigation. That matter is as I find it in the order of reference. (Here the Chairman read the instructions to the Committee.) It seems to me that, although Mr. Mulock may be prepared to make these charges against the action of the Government, we have no right whatever to investigate them. These charges should be formulated on the floor of Parliament, and a Committee should be struck to take charge of the work of investigation. The last time we met we proceeded to examine the different kinds of clothing, and I thought the inquiry to-day was for the purpose of showing whether that clothing was of a proper character for the militia; but an inquiry into the cause of dissatisfaction in the different battalions, it seems to me, would be endless. We are not clothed with functions to examine persons on oath. We cannot bring witnesses to contradict either one side or the other. It seems to me we are going entirely beyond our functions. I would, however, much rather, since these gentlemen are here, that we should be allowed to proceed; but if called upon to make a strict technical ruling, I think we are going beyond our functions.

MR. MULOCK.—Do you give it as your opinion that I cannot ask this witness anything in regard to the character of the uniforms issued to the Queen's Own? Is that the ruling? I have had him produced here. He tells me he has produced samples of the uniforms complained of, and he tells me that the battalion is thoroughly dissatisfied with the character of the uniforms issued, and he is prepared to testify of the dissatisfaction in that respect. Am I to be permitted to go into that?

Hon. Mr. DAVIES.—The hon. gentleman has given judgment before he heard the evidence, and it is always a good rule not to anticipate but to hear evidence before giving judgment.

Dr. FERGUSON.—Mr. Mulock told us what he intended to prove by this witness.

Mr. MULOCK.—I told you I intended to prove by him the condition of the whole regiment, and I can prove by him to the satisfaction of all impartial minds the treatment of the whole regiment of the Queen's Own; the whole regiment are dissatisfied.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL.—Does the whole of the dissatisfaction arise out of the clothing?

Mr. MULOCK.—If you allow the witness to be examined he will tell you; I can only tell you what he tells me, I mean in regard to the Queen's Own. Allow him to give you what I heard in Toronto on Saturday from a number of persons connected with the militia service. This witness will tell you of the thoroughly unsatisfactory character of the clothing issued to the Queen's Own. If you think one captain of the Queen's Own cannot prove the state of the whole regiment there are other captains who will give evidence. You can bring the captains down and if the majority of the commissioned officers of the Queen's Own do not sustain the contentions that I make I will pay the whole expenses of bringing them down here. If they do not sustain it in the opinion of the Chairman—I will let him be the judge.

Dr. FERGUSON.—He can invite the regiment from my county and they will disprove it.

Dr. HICKEY.—If the Queen's Own has been supplied with the clothing we examined at the last meeting the evidence is before us as to how the Queen's Own are clothed. The Committee took the trouble to investigate the kind of clothing, and any reasonable man would be satisfied with the clothing made in Canada.

Mr. WALLACE.—We ought to proceed with the investigation, but I do not think we ought to proceed with an investigation as to whether the militia of this country are satisfied with the Minister of Militia, because I think if that was the question there would be unanimous opposition against the Minister of Militia.

Mr. MULOCK.—How far am I to go?

The CHAIRMAN.—We were inquiring into the quality of the clothing, and we had samples produced here.

By Mr. Mulock :

373. Have you an idea of the general character of the clothing issued to the Queen's Own? I have.

374. Have you brought anything here to submit to the Committee on the point? Yes, I have.

375. Produce any samples you have.

Mr. MILLS, of Annapolis.—I submit the question as to whether this is a proper witness or not. Many witnesses have altered ideas about clothing.

Mr. HESON.—I would like to ask the witness what profession he follows.

The CHAIRMAN.—You may ask that afterward.

By Mr. Mulock :

376. What is your occupation? Wholesale grocer.

377. How long have you had experience in the militia service? Eleven years.

378. Will you select some of those samples of clothing? These are two tunics taken out of the regimental stores that have never been used.

379. What do you object to in regard to these? These are two different colors.

380. What should be the color? Rifle green.

381. Are either of them that? Something pretty near it.

382. What do you call this color? A sort of blue, as far as I can see.

383. Does that fairly represent the lack of uniformity in the color of the issue? When in the new issue—that is when issued first—but when the tunics are worn a year or two they become all kinds of shades. We have a dozen different shades. When that tunic is worn a year it turns one shade first and then another.

384. There is a lack of uniformity in the color. Have you got any that have been worn, so that we may see how they stand the wear? That is a uniform which a man in my company returned last Friday night. It has had two years' wear. That is the state of it.

385. How long ought it to be good for? They were issued for five years.

386. Will the issue last five years? It will not last that long.

387. What is this tunic (taking up another)? That is one of the issue of 1877—*an English tunic.*

388. And this other one was issued in 1887? Yes.

389. What is the condition of the two; how do they compare? I think the comparison is against the Canadian tunic.

390. Then the tunic of 1877 issued about ten years before this one is in a better condition than the one you are complaining of? Yes; we have uniforms in the regiment that were issued in 1867, that are better than this. We have a few issued at that date.

391. This uniform of the issue of 1877, has it been in use as constantly as this one of 1867? More so. They both came out of the company.

392. They are both in constant use? Yes.

393. This one was used as much? Yes; and the man refused to turn out for spring drill unless I gave him another tunic.

394. I ask you, whether the tunic of 1877, which you produce, has been worn as much as the one issued within the last two years? Yes.

395. And as a result of the comparison the one issued two years ago has suffered more from wear in two years than the other in twelve? Yes.

396. You say that on your honor as an officer of the Queen's Own? Yes.

397. Well, does that evidence apply generally to the issue in question? It does.

398. It applies generally to the issue to the men? There is the greatest dissatisfaction amongst the men of the regiment in regard to the Canadian issues.

399. How do you know that? I know that from my personal experience in my own company.

400. I am told that the regiment has become so dissatisfied—I have stated here in the Committee that owing to the character of the uniforms issued to them they have decided—

MR. MCCARTHY.—Surely now that question is beyond the power of the Committee—go on and ask the question?

By Mr. Mulock :

401. I am told that the whole of the Queen's Own regiment are ordering new uniforms at their own expense from England. Is that not correct? That is perfectly correct. They are not all ordered yet, but they will eventually all order I believe. The majority of the companies have ordered now.

402. What companies have ordered now? "A," "B," "C," "D," "G," and "H." I think those are all that have ordered now.

403. Ordered what? New clothing, both tunics and trowsers from England.

404. Why? Because the men are ashamed to turn out in the uniforms they have now.

405. Those having been worn or new ones? What is in the regiment now. We have all kinds and all sorts and conditions of uniforms.

406. Would they be satisfied with new uniforms from the department? They would not, from the experience they have of those in use now, and besides that, we can get them much cheaper than what the department charge.

407. Have you got an English one here? Yes (producing tunic). This is a sample. This is the English sample. This is the tunic of a private. That will be a tunic of a private with the exception of the braid on the sleeve.

408. What does it cost laid down in Canada, that sample from England? That costs laid down here,—I might say that every man is measured and the measure is sent home and the tunic is made to fit him properly. We have also the letters "Q

O. R." worked on the tunic, and the tunic is ready to put on, and that costs, taking sterling at ten per cent. \$5.68 laid down, including freight, insurance, &c.

By Hon. Mr. Foster :

409. Is that for the tunic alone? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock :

410. Now, if instead of buying one of these he was to take one of the issue from the military stores, is the volunteer put to any expense in regard to the Canadian issue? In the first place, if we buy a tunic from the department we pay \$6.50 for it, and then in 99 cases out of 100 that tunic has got to be altered. If a tunic has got to be altered it costs every man from \$2 to \$3 for alterations.

411. Then in 99 cases out of 100 every volunteer who is given a Canadian tunic is obliged, out of his own pocket, to pay from \$2 to \$3, or an average of \$2.50 a year to make that tunic fit him? Yes; unless he wishes to come down and make a show of himself.

412. As a matter of fact they do? Yes.

413. So that it costs a militiaman \$6.50 to the department for a tunic and an average of \$2.50 to make it fit him—that is \$9—and then he has got a tunic. Is that tunic then in appearance, quality and durability equal to the one you buy in England at \$5.68? No; not by a long odds. That is the uniform we are to get.

414. For \$5.68 you have an English uniform and for \$9 you have a Canadian uniform. Now, just give us your opinion as to the relative merits of what the volunteers get, between the English and Canadian militia uniforms? Of course this is an English uniform and we have never had any experience with that particular uniform; but I believe it has been tested here and found to be "nearly all wool beaver"—that is the expression used. It will last from five to six and seven years, while the Canadian uniforms will only last, as our experience proves, about two years.

415. So much for durability. What about appearance? There is no two questions about the appearance. Any person who examines these tunics will see.

416. What about the lasting of the dyes? That is guaranteed. This tunic is guaranteed.

417. That is the English? Yes.

418. Your experience of the Canadian dyed green cloth is that it is not a fast color? No. That is the very best tunic we could get. We have had other offers from large London firms, and we have had offers to supply us with tunics equal to what is supplied the 60th Rifles at \$4.50; but we wanted the very best, and that dye was guaranteed.

419. Now, you have mentioned a number of companies that have given these orders in your battalion; have you communicated with the officers on the subject? When I received the summons to attend before this Committee I dropped a note to the officers commanding the different companies to see if their views coincided with mine on this subject, and I received a number of replies which fully bear me out.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is not a regular way of proving anything?

Mr. MULOCK.—You can produce these witnesses if you prefer it. A statement over a man's own name is about as good as a statement here.

WITNESS.—Do you wish me to read these?

420. Yes; if the Committee wish it. This is from Captain Thompson, of —

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—I object to this. I think it is rather unfair to have these private notes written by Mr. Bennett's friends to him.

Mr. MULOCK.—The Minister need not be so anxious to burk the inquiry.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—He should not say that. Not only do I not desire to burk the inquiry, but I have given him every opportunity to establish this case which he is trying to establish. I appeal to you as a lawyer, and ask you if it has been known before in any Committee that any gentleman could attempt to go into the evidence of a character which the hon. gentleman is now trying to bring forward before this Committee. If we are to have an investigation, it should be conducted according to the rules which prevail in every examination of this kind. Here is a gentleman who asks Capt. Bennett what kind of note he wrote, and he was unable to say; and

now he wants to read letters in answer to one which we know nothing about, and which the hon. gentleman is going to ask the witness to tell us about from memory.

MR. MULOCK.—I do not know that the matter which my hon. friend refers to is at all material to an understanding of this communication.

HON. MR. BOWELL.—What do we care about that. There is nobody disputing Bennett's veracity.

MR. MULOCK.—I want to see what this letter says. I want to see what he corroborates.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think really that is not evidence.

By Mr. Mulock:

421. Where did you get these letters, Capt. Bennett?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—I object to these letters being gone into.

By Mr. Mulock:

422. Where did you get these letters, Capt. Bennett?

MR. MILLS (Annapolis). That is foreign to the inquiry.

DR. FERGUSON.—I think the witness is here to prove what Mr. Mulock wants to prove.

MR. MULOCK.—Inasmuch as Dr. Ferguson seeks to discredit this witness, I want to ask Capt. Bennett how he came to consult his brother officers as he says he has done?

WITNESS.—Well, sir, the reason I consulted my brother officers was that it was in the interests of the corps that I was to come down here. If I came down here as an individual and gave my own evidence it would be nothing. I came down to be able to give the opinion of my brother officers as well.

MR. MILLS (Annapolis).—I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is manufactured testimony.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—I think that this is a gross insult to the witness and an insult to the Committee. It is a disgraceful thing to have done.

MR. MCCARTHY.—The hon. gentleman who has just spoken administered a rebuke to the member who is conducting the examination.

MR. MULOCK.—I want to ask this witness how he came to get these things?

THE CHAIRMAN.—You have already asked that question. This is not pertinent to the inquiry. What is the use of wasting the time of the Committee in this way?

By Mr. Mulock:

424. Dr. Ferguson has stated that your evidence was part of a concocted scheme between us to injure the department. Is there any truth in that statement? I never knew you before in my life until I received the summons.

425. Never knew me until after you received this summons? No.

By Dr. Ferguson:

426. Had you no communication with Mr. Mulock? Yes; but not until after I received the summons.

By Mr. Mulock:

427. When did you first see me? I saw you in Toronto on Saturday morning.

428. How was that? I was passing along King Street with a friend of mine, and when I saw you coming I asked him if you were Mr. Mulock. He said "yes." I introduced myself to you and asked you for what purpose I was going to Ottawa. I had noticed in the morning that my name had been brought up by you as a witness before the Committee. That was the first time I had ever spoken to you in my life.

429. What did I tell you? You told me that I was going to go to Ottawa to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in this matter. That is what I have done. The only interest I have is the interest of the corps.

430. Did you ever have any communication direct or indirect with me until you happened to put this question to me on the street? No; never before.

By Dr. Ferguson:

431. Did Mr. Mulock tell you what he wanted you to say? No.

By Mr. Mulock :

432. What are your politics? Conservative. I have always been so, and my family have always been. I think it is only fair to Mr. Mulock to state that. We never had any communications regarding my evidence to day.

By Dr. Ferguson :

433. From whom did this summons come? By the—

THE CHAIRMAN.—By the clerk in the regular way.

434. DR. FERGUSON.—How did the witness come to know about Mr. Mulock's case before the Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN.—He read it in the papers.

By Dr. Bergin :

435. You belong to the Queen's Own, sir? Yes, sir.

HON. MR. BOWELL.—We are to investigate the payments for this year under certain items in the Public Accounts. It has not been established that these questions apply to these payments at all. It has not been established that this clothing which has been exhibited here to-day was made under the contract we are investigating, or were made by Mr. Sanford.

By Dr. Bergin :

436. Where did you get the clothing you have exhibited here to-day? This English tunic I received from England, from Hudson & Sons.

437. When? This spring. That is the pattern one we are ordering from.

438. Where did you get that next tunic? That one? Out of the regimental stores.

439. When? On Saturday.

440. Do you know how long it had been in the regimental stores before you got it? From 1885 or 1886.

441. How do you know? Who is the manufacturer? W. E. Sanford.

442. How do you know it was not there before 1885 or 1886? I know.

443. How do you know? Because the tunics were worn out in the North-West and there was not a single tunic in store.

444. Are you sure that this was not a tunic put in the stores at that time? I would not like to make that statement.

445. You do not know anything about this tunic then? No; only what I have seen in the regimental books. We could not identify any single tunic.

446. Then you should not have brought it here. Put it aside. Do you know anything about this one? What tunic is that? That is a tunic returned to my company's stores last Friday night.

447. How long has it been in use? Two years.

448. Is it the property of the regiment, of the Government, or the property of the private in your company? It is the property of the Government, I presume.

449. Why was it returned to you? Because it was unfit for service.

450. What is wrong with it? Will you give me the character of the man who has been wearing that tunic? One of the most steady men in my company.

451. It does not say much for the rest of them if after two years that tunic is in that condition? It does not say much for the clothing.

452. If with the small amount of drill that tunic can be in that condition after two years, the rest have not been taken care of? That is what we complain of.

453. That the men did not take care of them? No; that after two years' wear the tunics get in that condition.

454. I have had a great deal of experience and I have some idea as to how long tunics and trowsers ought to last. We have had good cloth and bad cloth, but I have never seen cloth give out so readily as that after two years. Where was that tunic made? I don't know. There is no mark on it. It is Canadian issue.

455. Was that tunic in the North-West? No.

456. Quite sure? Quite sure; that was a new tunic in 1886.

457. Where do you get your own tunics—the officers? Some of them have them made in England and some have been made in Toronto by the regimental tailor.

458. They are all the same color now, are they? Pretty much.

459. They are all of them? I would not like to state positively.

460. Is there not as much or more difference in the colors of the tunics of the officers of the Queen's Own as in the tunics of the men? Not to my knowledge.

461. Have you directed your attention to that? No.

462. How long does an officer's tunic manufactured in England wear? I cannot speak from experience; my uniform is made in Canada, but it is of English cloth, I understand.

463. Now, I want to ascertain from you where that tunic came from? I want to know and the Committee want to know it, where that tunic you say has been two years in the service came from? I do not know anything about who is the maker of the tunics at all. I am not giving evidence on that point.

464. Do you know when it was put in store? It was put in store in 1885 or 1886.

By Hon. Mr. Powell :

465. Are you sure it is Canadian? I do not know anything about it.

466. Was it made in this country or in England? I do not know anything about it.

THE CHAIRMAN.—The Committee was led to believe that that tunic was made in this country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—It is an English tunic, that.

HON. Mr. DAVIES.—Has the department obtained any goods in England since 1886?

By Mr. Bergin :

467. I would like to get from this witness is that a Canadian-made tunic? I don't know who the makers of the tunics are.

468. Yet you endeavored to give the Committee the impression that that was a tunic furnished you by the department, was made in this country, and did not last two years.

Mr. McCARTHY.—That is the examiner's theory, but not the witness'. Captain Bennett did not say that.

WITNESS.—We do not know where the tunics came from. All I know is that the tunic was issued since 1886.

469. Now, will you be good enough, since you know nothing about it, to tell me what you know about the other one. What do you know about that tunic? I know that is an English-made tunic. It is issued as an English tunic.

470. How long worn? Since 1877.

471. Has it been worn steadily all that time? I could not say as to that. It has been in use in the company.

472. Since you do not know anything about it, as to whether it has been used or not, let us know what you know about the next one? I do not give any evidence as to who made the tunics or anything of that kind. We do not take any interest in who makes them.

473. You do not know who made them, or whether they are good or bad? I do.

474. How do you come to be here as a witness? The other day in this Committee Mr. Mulock told us you could give important testimony as regards the material of which the clothing was made; that is, as served out to the Queen's Own regiment.

Mr. MULOCK.—That is not what I said. I said the officers of the Queen's Own had rejected the issue from this department, and had out of their own pockets ordered uniforms from England, and that is the character of the evidence I propose to lay before you.

475. Dr. BERGIN.—You asked that Captain Bennett—because you believed (repeating a phrase that I had used) he could give important and startling information to the Committee. Now, I want to know from Captain Bennett, to whom he gave that important and startling information before Mr. Mulock made that statement last

week? I never gave it to anybody. I was quite surprised when I found my name mentioned in the matter.

476. Did you discuss this matter with your brother officers? It has been a general theme in the regiment for the last three or four years.

477. Did they make any representations to headquarters? I believe they have.

478. In what way? I do not know that they made any officially.

479. Really, you have come here for the purpose of giving information. You do not know anything about any of the clothing or material you bring here, and with which you expected to enlighten the Committee as to the condition of things in the Queen's Own regiment? In the first place I did not come here with the intention of startling or enlightening the Committee.

480. Were you instructed to bring these here? No.

481. On whose motion did you bring them here? Nobody's motion.

482. On whose suggestion did you bring them here? I thought the proofs here would be better than my own words.

483. Then, when Mr. Mulock made the statement the other day that you could give startling and important evidence, he did not do so from anything you had said to him? Not at all.

484. Did you say so to anybody else? No.

485. You are quite sure? I may have spoken my views pretty freely to my brother officers, but not outside of them.

486. Do you know there have been a good many letters in the press denouncing the department and finding fault with it? I have seen a good many letters.

487. Were those letters inspired or dictated by you? No, sir.

488. You had nothing whatever to do with them? No.

489. You do not know who wrote them? No, sir.

490. No suspicion? No, sir.

491. Have you had no communication with the party? No, sir.

492. Then you are not able to state to the Committee that any of the tunics you have here are of the issue which is being attacked? They are the last issue.

493. Which of them is last year's issue? It is the last year's issue which is being attacked, is it not?

494. I have been trying to find out from you what year these tunics were issued in? Because the contractor does not see fit to mark the year on the tunic, nobody can prove what year that tunic was issued.

495. The impression endeavored to be made on the Committee is that they are of such poor quality that they are of no use and do not wear; that they are given to the regiment to last five years, and are of such poor quality that they will not last two; and that they are of Canadian manufacture? I do not know anything about Canadian manufacture. I never mentioned Canadian manufacture. We do not know who the contractor is.

Hon. Mr. JONES.—It makes no difference when they were issued. The important point we wish to arrive at is, how long they have been in use, and if they were issued ten years ago by the department or only issued a year ago, it would not make any odds. What I presume the Committee desires to know is, how long these tunics have been in use in the Queen's Own.

By Mr. Peter White:

496. I think this is an important point, that we are inquiring into sums that occur in these public accounts. You say that the tunic you produce here is delivered here from England for \$5.68? Yes, sir.

497. Have you used any of these tunics? No, sir.

498. Can you tell from your experience or the experience of your men, whether they will wear longer or shorter than tunics issued by the department? We can only tell by previous experience with English tunics, and we have had this cloth tested by parties in Toronto who are supposed to know something about it.

499. Do these goods come in free of duty? No; but we expect the Minister of Militia will see to that.

500. You expect the duty will be subtracted? Yes.

501. And so far as your experience goes you know nothing about the wearing qualities of these tunics. I heard you say that the tunics issued by the department had to be altered to suit the forms of the men? Yes.

502. Would that apply in the same way if a contract had been made with the English manufacturers as well as with Canadian manufacturers; that if instead of your men sending their measures to the English tailor a contract had been made by the Department of Militia with an English manufacturer, would not the same objection apply. That is, would the tunics be found to fit your men; would they not require to be altered? From our past experience with English manufacturers we found the fits were far better.

503. Why? They knew how to cut them out better I suppose.

504. Of course. I do not understand that you know as to whether this particular tunic that you refer to as having worn out in two years is an English or a Canadian manufacture? I do not know anything about that.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

505. You have just stated that from your experience the English tunics, the fit of the English tunics, was far better than the fit of the Canadian tunics? Yes.

506. Now, is it not a fact, that supposing instead of a Canadian issue; or supposing that instead of an issue to your battalion of Canadian-made tunics, the department had issued English-made tunics: Is it not a fact that you would have had to have them refitted just in the same way as you have had to get the tailor to alter the Canadian-made tunics which were issued out? I admit that, of course, that some men you could not fit them anyway.

507. Is it a fact, taking the average? Taking the average, I say that the fits of the English tunics were greater than the fits of the Canadian tunics.

508. Evidently you do not understand my question. I wish to know from you whether you would have to alter the English-made tunics provided you did not send the measure of every individual man to the tailor in England; taking an issue of English tunics, would it be necessary for these tunics to be altered so as to fit properly; would it be necessary for these tunics to be altered just in the same way as the Canadian tunics are altered? I think I understood that question before and I answered it. I say that a certain number of them would, but not as many in proportion as of Canadian tunics.

509. I understand from you that an issue of English tunics could be served out to the men without being altered? No, I don't say that. I say they could be served out without as many being altered as they would if Canadian tunics were served out.

510. You do not consider that every tunic has to be altered? No.

511. In the case of Canadian tunics you consider that every tunic would have to be altered? No, I did not say that; I say more Canadian tunics would have to be altered?

512. The proportion would be larger? Yes.

513. What company do you belong to? "G" Company.

514. You have expressed your opinion about clothing and have consulted with a number of your officers; will you tell me if you are speaking in the evidence you have given on behalf of your commanding officer and if you are so authorized to speak before the Committee? No, sir, our commanding officer is at present out of town and I could not consult him in the matter.

515. You have no knowledge of any official communication having been made by the Queen's Own to the department complaining of the issue of the clothing? I have no knowledge of any official communication. I have heard complaints have been made.

516. I understood you to say that one of the advantages of importing tunics from England was that you could get them cheaper than in Canada? Yes.

517. Now is it not a fact that the tunics were issued to your men from the department free of cost? A certain number of them were. As you are no doubt

aware, sir, we are only allowed 42 tunics per company, and you are also no doubt aware that we have as many as fifty, fifty-five and sixty, and we have to pay of course for all the tunics over the authorized number.

518. You have said that you had to pay \$6.50 per tunic? Yes.

519. Now, are you quite sure of that; you have paid it no doubt yourself? I have. I have also seen a memorandum signed by Col. Macpherson giving the prices to our quartermaster.

520. Well, what person are you referring to now? How long ago? I think that was signed either in 1886 or 1887, but I paid last fall. I ordered four tunics last fall, and I paid the same price. I saw the quartermaster and he told me he had received no official notice of a change. That price was paid last fall before the inspection.

521. That was last fall? Yes.

522. Of course, you knew that the department issued the clothing at cost price? I presume they did.

523. Have you made any special study of dyes. I heard you express an opinion about the dye being very inferior in one of the tunics which you laid upon the table? I did not say the dye was inferior. I said the colors were different.

524. I understood you to say the dye was of an inferior quality? We have had this very practical experience:—In standing behind your company on parade. Then you will see the difference in the color.

525. Did you not express the opinion that the dye was of inferior quality? The results show that. I am not a dyer.

526. Will you point out to me that tunic which has done so little service, and which you have referred to already as having been returned by one of your men into the stores as being unfit for use? That is the one that was returned last Friday night.

527. You cannot state who the maker of that tunic is? No.

528. Whether this is a Canadian-made tunic or an English? Except this, it was issued in the fall of 1886, when we had no tunics in the stores. In 1885 when a portion of the battalion went to the North-West and returned, there was not a tunic in store, and we received 285 to make up for those that were worn out in the North-West.

529. I wish to prove by Mr. Watson—I think it will save time—this fact:—Mr. Watson, as the Committee knows, is our Inspector of Stores. I wish to establish by him that that tunic is English-made and manufactured out of English cloth.

By Dr. Bergin:

530. I wish to ask a question first. How many years were you captain of this Company? Two years.

531. Were you commanding any other company in the regiment before this? I was captain in command, or in charge.

532. How many issues of clothing were made to this company while you were connected with it? We had an issue of tunics in August, 1877.

533. Was that Canadian or English? English. That was about the time I joined the battalion.

534. When was the next issue? In March, 1880. That was a small issue of 75.

535. Canadian or English? English. I am taking this from the regimental books.

536. When was the next? 21st May, 1881.

537. What was that: Canadian or English? No memorandum on the books.

538. When was the next one? July, 1885.

539. What was that, Canadian or English? That was to replace those used in the North-West.

540. Canadian or English? No memorandum.

541. Have you had any issue since? October, 1886, 141.

542. Was that Canadian or English? No memorandum.

543. You do not know anything about that? Except that they have been Canadian since they first commenced the manufacture in Canada.

544. Then the English tunics lasted three years; from 1877 to 1880? No, sir; I did not say that.

545. In 1877, you state you had an English issue, and in 1881 you had another English issue? That was only 75 of an addition.

546. In 1885 you had an issue and you cannot tell anything about them nor since? Yes; we are entitled to 420 tunics and we get the balance by purchase.

By Mr. Scarth:

547. You stated that your experience was, that English tunics would require a less proportion of new fitting than Canadian? That is my experience.

548. What experience do you base that upon? On general information gathered from the regiment.

549. But on your own knowledge? Yes; my own knowledge. I have worn both Canadian and English, when I was in the ranks.

550. You are speaking from your own knowledge? Yes.

551. How many English tunics had you worn and how many Canadian? I wore one English and one Canadian.

552. How long did your English last? Did you require either of them altered? I required the English to be altered, but not so much as the Canadian.

553. You required to have them both altered. Your knowledge is simply from your own wear? Except what I have gathered from the regiment.

554. Is it only with regard to two tunics that your own experience goes? I gather this from the regimental tailor who does all this.

555. But from your own knowledge you have only worn one English tunic and one Canadian. Is it upon that you base your statement? No, sir.

556. Who is your regimental tailor? Green & Houston.

By Mr. McCarthy:

557. What did you pay for altering your uniform. You spoke of having both? It is many years ago. I cannot say. These tailors will not touch anything under \$1.50 or \$2.00.

558. Is that what you pay in each case? Somewhere about that cost,

559. There was some statement made here about it costing \$2.50 each. Somebody made the average. I said it would cost from \$2 to \$3.

By Hon. Mr. Davies:

560. There is one point I would like to ask you upon. There seems to be a good deal of doubt in the minds of some of us about the manufacture of that tunic, a good many assert that it is an English tunic. I have heard that this is not so. After looking at it they pronounced it to be an English tunic. Are you sure that that came in the issue of 1885 and 1886? Yes.

561. There can be no doubt about it? There can be no doubt about that. It was issued since the time of the rebellion and there were no tunics in then.

By Dr. Bergin:

562. You produce one you say was about 11 years in store? No, in use.

By Mr. Mulock:

563. Do you know anything about the condition of the uniforms of the Queen's Own Band? Yes.

564. What is the condition of the uniforms of the Queen's Own Band? Well, I know that they are just about getting a complete new outfit.

565. From where? I don't know where they came from.

566. Why? Because the others are worn out.

567. When were they issued to them? In October, 1886.

568. How long should that issue have lasted? Five years.

569. It ought to have lasted five years?

By Mr. Taylor:

570. Where were they made, the uniforms worn by the band? I do not know.

571. They were Government issue. You do not know whether Canadian-make or American make? No.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

572. Captain Bennett, have you seen the last samples of the Canadian clothing? Would you look at these two samples, please? It is a hard looking sample. I don't pretend to be an expert.

573. Taking these two coats for instance, which do you think would be the best supposing you were getting them for your own regiment, which would you prefer, now? I would say that is the best.

574. That happens to be the Canadian cloth. I will keep it. I will keep my hand on it.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

575. You have spoken of the cost of altering tunics? Yes.

576. Do I understand you to say it costs about \$2.50 or \$3? It costs from \$2 to \$3.

577. You are not aware that we pay 40 cents in the Infantry Schools for altering tunics? I am not. I was just merely saying what it costs us.

578. You have expensive tailors?

By Sir Richard Cartwright :—

579. Captain Bennett, if I correctly understood, you stated that the tunic which you had imported from England cost \$5.68. Yes.

580. You also stated, I think, that that sum was paid for articles made to measure? Yes.

581. You stated, I think, likewise, that you could have obtained from England tunics in the lump? What figure did you name? \$4.50. These are also made to order.

582. I want to know one thing from you, if you have had experience which will enable you to answer the question. If you sent an order for 500 tunics, would you get them cheaper than if you had special measurements? I presume so. We did not go into that. It would be much cheaper making them.

583. All you had in this way were by special measurement? A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

584. Is it not a fact that one man will have a coat of the same quality and wear it for three or four years, and another man would not wear it two years without destroying it? I suppose there is something in that, sir.

585. Don't you know it from your own experience? It depends upon the man.

By Hon. Mr. Davies :

586. I would like to ask you one question: In your regiment, when you were supplied with English tunics and trowsers, did the same complaints exist as regards the wear of these tunics and trowsers as when you were supplied with the Canadian manufacture? No; they did not.

587. Was it your experience that the men, as a whole, reported to their Colonel and officers as to the clothing, that the English clothing was better than Canadian? We never heard any complaints at all.

588. Never heard any at all? No.

589. MR. TAYLOR—How do you know you have been supplied with Canadian clothing?

WITNESS—I never said we had been.

MR. DAVIES—I assume it to be so, because the Minister of Militia produced contracts for the last five or six years.

MR. TAYLOR—It does not follow. The clothing that was sent to the stores may have been bought during the Mackenzie Administration.

WITNESS—I know the issue of 1877 was English clothing.

590. You do not know that you ever got any Canadian-made clothing? No.

By Mr. McMullen :

591. In what way do the trowsers give out? General bad wear.

592. Was the sewing bad? No, it is in the material.

Mr. WATSON recalled and further examined.

By Mr. Bowell :

593. You saw me exhibit these two coats to Capt. Bennett, and I give you this one which he selected as being the best. Can you tell me which it is, English or Canadian? It is our Canadian make, made by the Sanford Manufacturing Company of Hamilton.

594. What is this one? The English sealed pattern.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

595. You heard the evidence about the English tunic which was returned into the stores. Will you state to the Committee what that tunic is; whether it was manufactured in Canada or if it is English? It is an English-made tunic. We never had that from Canada. Our tunics are all marked with the manufacturer's name on the tab. Besides, I know it by the quality of the lining and the general make up.

596. Are you quite positive? I am satisfied that that is an English-made tunic.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

597. Can you tell me who sent it? No. We may have some in stock to-day. We have some in stock now and they do not put the name on the tabs the same as we do.

By Mr. Bowell :

598. Then the issue which you made in 1886 or 1887 may have been of English manufacture? We have a lot of English clothing yet of all lines except one or two.

By Mr. McMullen :

599. Is that tab sewed on by a tailor? I do not see it.

600. You say English tunics have the stamp of the maker on them? No, sir; ours have.

601. I want to know if this is the original tab? I cannot say.

602. You ought to be the judge. It is quite clear it is not.

Mr. TAYLOR.—Talk about bluffing a witness! He said he knew it from the tab, and lining and general make up.

By Mr. Davies :

603. Do we understand you to say that you judge this from something connected with the tab. I understood you to say that? That is one of the means.

604. That is the means by which you judged it when you took up the tunic a little while ago? Not altogether.

605. You examined the tab and then you pronounced your opinion. Did you give it as your opinion because you did not see the stamp on the tab? Not on that ground only.

606. But that was one of them? Yes.

607. The English tunics have not the stamp on the tab? No; although in some cases they have.

608. It is not a good rule to go on? We never have Canadian tunics without them.

609. You will give no opinion as to whether or not that tab was sewed on by a tailor? I cannot say anything about that.

610. But looking at it could you form no opinion about it? It is not well done.

611. Are you the inspector of clothing? Yes.

612. As inspector you decline to give any opinion as to whether that was sewn on by the maker or not? I say it is impossible for me to say whether it was sewn on by a tailor or not.

613. You do not, however, give an opinion? I do not know.

614. What are the other reasons? That cloth is of a different make from our regular make and the lining is different.

615. In what respect is the lining and cloth different? I looked at this since this gentleman left it out of his hand, and it is a different class of cloth from that which is in the Canadian tunics here.

616. There is great difference in the cloth of the Canadian tunics and the English? There is a difference in the quality of the goods and the finish.

617. Can you tell the reason why you came to the conclusion that this is an English tunic? I know it from the cloth. From the general trimmings and general make up.

618. Can you point out the difference? This is a different lining. That is entirely different from this. This is a special make and I may say that this particular make of lining has been put in every Canadian tunic we have had.

619. Have you issued many English-made tunics since 1885? We have.

620. How many? I cannot say. I know of them going out, and I know of the stock being on hand.

621. When did you commence the manufacture of Canadian tunics? I think the first issue was in 1884.

622. Do you know how many tunics were manufactured in that year; do you know how many? Well, from memory I could not state.

623. About? What line?

624. Scarlet or rifle? That tunic we would not get more than about a thousand in a year.

625. What quantity had you on hand then? I could not tell you. We might have had probably a thousand.

626. Probably a thousand in 1884? Yes.

627. You have got no more English tunics since that? Yes, we got Canadian tunics since.

628. You have not had any more English? I think not. I think our last issue from England was in 1884.

629. How many did you get that year? I would not say how many that year. I think they generally came in thousand lots. That is for the rifle, and generally 4,000 or 5,000 for the infantry.

630. The reason you gave for assuming it to be an English tunic was that the English tunic has no name marked. I see some of them have, so that is not a good reason? That is not a good reason.

631. You then say the reason was simply of the kind of cloth now? I know that we have no Canadian-made tunics without the manufacturer's name marked on it.

632-33. All these tunics here which have no mark on are English then, if I understand you? I can show you hundreds in the store of English-make without a mark.

634. Some of them have? Yes; some of them have.

635. There is one without a mark. Would you judge that without a mark? Of course, there is no mark on that. I would not base it exclusively on the mark.

By Hon. Mr. Jones:

636. Do I understand you that there is English clothing still in the department? Yes.

637. Is it not, as a matter of fact, that there is only the engineer clothing in the department, which is not so much in demand as the others? We have a demand for all.

638. Not so much? We have all the lines of English stuff in store, with the exception that in some cases there is not sufficient for the battalions, and we are used to putting in one kind as much as possible. We are trying to get rid of the English stuff, but it is chiefly in odd sizes. For instance, we have a large number of small sizes.

639. As a matter of fact you have only a few job lots of English clothing on hand? In some lines they are heavy. Cavalry clothing is heavy. In some lines they are made up of odd sizes and they are incomplete.

640. They are chiefly of the cavalry or engineer uniforms? Yes, and others.

By Mr. Hesson :

641. Which is the best, the English or Canadian quality of clothing, as far as you know? I answered that question the other day with reference to that matter. I corroborate what I said the other day, I have not altered my opinion.

642. What was your opinion? I made the statement then, taking the two goods, comparing them one beside the other, that I considered that the Canadian goods were made from purer stock and consequently were better goods. Our manufacturers do not stuff or weight them to the same extent as the English do.

643. What about the color? I think in the matter of the colors of the tunics I have seen here to-day that the colors have not given out, consequently they must be pure indigo dyes. If it was anything else than indigo dye they would not stand a week under our Canadian sun.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

644. Look at this particular tunic in your hands? It is a very good tunic.

645. I ask Mr. Watson his opinion of this particular tunic. This is the sample Captain Bennett produced. I ask your opinion of the make so far as you can judge? It is a good tunic, very good and very nicely made.

By Mr. Mulock :

646. How does it compare with your issue in the quality of the cloth? Well, I believe it is a better tunic than our sealed pattern. That is, our English sealed pattern.

647. How does it compare with the issue under the contract that is now running, the Canadian contract that Mr. Sanford has delivered under the contract of 1887. How does it compare in quality as to the cloth, fit, cut and dye? I would require to test it for dye, and the dye I presume is good.

648. How does that cloth compare with the cloth under the issue under the Sanford & Co.'s contract? This stock is not absolutely pure, while that of the Canadian is.

649. You mean there is no shoddy in it? There is no shoddy in the Canadian-made goods, and in this there is weight and stuffing.

650. Will that be as durable as Canadian or as what Mr. Sanford has supplied? Well, I do not think it ought to, from the fact that it is not pure. That is the only ground upon which I can arrive at it.

651. Have you any opinion as to color? The color appears good.

652. What about the color of the trimmings? Very good.

653. And the general make-up? Very good.

654. Is what you are getting under the contract as well made? I believe it is quite as well made as that.

By Mr. Hesson :

655. Do you find the stock generally turn out as well as per sample? These samples I have here are taken from stock at random.

656. If you were ordering from England, do you suppose the quality of the goods would be up to the sample throughout? Would the general stock be equal to the sample? My experience has not been so. We have had hundreds of trowsers re-sewn before issuing them from store at the manufacturer's expense. We have never had to re-sew Canadian trowsers yet before their issue.

By Mr. McMullen :

657. What is your position in the service? Inspector.

658. Inspector of clothing? Yes.

MAJOR VINCE, of Woodstock, N. B., called and examined.

By Mr. Bowell :

659. Are you connected with the force of New Brunswick? Yes.

660. In what branch? Engineers. Since February, 1880, I have been in command of an engineer's company. I came from Woodstock, N. B. I was, however,

in command of No. 8 Company of the Infantry from September, 1867, to February, 1880, and in command of the Brighton Engineers from February, 1880, to the present. I have been in the militia service altogether 22 years.

661. Have you had any experience with the clothing of the volunteers? I have had charge of the clothing of the company ever since I have been in connection with the militia.

662. I was going to ask generally, for the information of the Committee, what his experience is with reference to the quality, the length of time that the clothing would wear, and have him make a comparison between that which is issued as Canadian with that which is imported? When we first became engineers in February, 1880, about May or June we received an issue of what we were informed was English trowsers. As regards engineers tunics I have no knowledge. I am speaking of trowsers and greatcoats. We received an issue of English trowsers in 1880. Our men work very hard. They have to go into the streams and build bridges and it is heavy work. The trowsers lasted the camp of 1880 and 1881, the camp in Essex in 1882 which was 12 days, and the camp in Essex in 1883, which was 12 days more. When we went into camp in 1884 I had to get partly worn clothing to do my duty in that year. In 1885 I received an issue of Canadian trowsers, English tunics and Canadian great coats. The trowsers were worn in the camp of 1885 at Fredericton, and we had a large amount of digging. The camp of 1886 was in Essex and the camp of 1887 at St. Andrews, and we wore them again in the camp of 1888, and with the exception of putting on a new issue of trowsers for inspection day and for parade on Sundays we have worn these trowsers, and we have them on hand now for use as a second pair of trowsers for the men in this year. These are Canadian. The greatcoats we received in 1885. They are Canadian coats, for they have the red collar, and we wore them in the camp of 1886, 1887 and 1888. They seemingly are good greatcoats in every respect to-day.

By Mr. Davies :

663. The greatcoats ought not to be worn out. A man in camp has harder work than other people. Part of the men naturally sleep in their clothes in the tents. They lie around. They take their dinners and a certain amount of grease where men have no tables nor seats to sit on, is sure to fall on them. In all these respects they have done very well. That is my experience.

By Mr. Wallace :

664. What about the comparison of English trowsers and Canadian? My men are all heavy men. Twelve out of fifteen pairs break across the seat and some of them down here (pointing to the crutch). Of the Canadian trowsers some have broken, but not in so large a proportion—four or five pairs perhaps. As far as the fitting of the Canadian trowsers is concerned, my experience is that they fit better. For this reason, I think that more are made to the configuration of our own men. I think Englishmen are probably of a little different build to what we are here. If you take English store clothing—I mean English clothing not made to contract or anything like that—and as far as I have seen I am of the opinion that it does not fit the people of this country, at least the people of New Brunswick, as well as the Canadian clothing. I am speaking of English clothing made for the average man in Canada, and the average man in England.

By Mr. Mulock :

665. Your first issue in 1880 was of English clothing? Yes, of English clothing. English trowsers.

666. When did you get your next? In 1885; in the fall.

667. When was the next issue? We received another issue in the summer of 1888. Before the camp of 1888.

668. So in 1885 you had a remnant of the issue of 1880? No; the issue of 1880 lasted me 1881 and 1882. When I went into camp in 1883 Col. Taylor was kind enough to give me some part worn trowsers of the New Brunswick Engineers, which were partly worn out. I had more infantry trowsers. My way is to get two sets of clothing for each man in the company. I have kept my old infantry trowsers and

the English clothing I had received did me in 1881, 1882 and 1883. I went into camp with them and I got some part worn to help me out, and what I received of Canadian make I used in 1885, in 1886, 1887 and 1888 with the old ones of last year, and I used the new ones simply for church parade and inspection. I have them to use this year.

669. How many days were they used? Thirteen days in each year.

670. That would be 52 days? Yes, and 52 nights probably.

671. What is the average life of trowsers for the engineers in the regulars? I presume from information I have received that engineers in the service receive one pair of cloth and two pairs of serge every year, besides a blouse and overalls for work.

672. As far as you are concerned you are satisfied? Yes; satisfied.

Mr. WATSON recalled and further examined.

By Mr. Mulock:

673. Have you one of the overcoats here? Yes.

674. These are the overcoats that are being issued? Yes.

675. These were the overcoats delivered under the contract of James O'Brien?

Yes.

OLIVER WILBY, of Toronto, called and examined.

By Mr. Mulock:

676. You are a manufacturer of woollen and shoddy goods at Weston? Yes.

677. How long have you been in business in Canada? Nineteen years.

678. You have some knowledge of the prices prevailing in the last ten years?

Yes.

679. Just look at that cloth? What about it?

680. Will you tell me whether or not the market price of that cloth is higher or lower since 1884? All cloth has gone lower. We can manufacture the cloth to-day for less money than at the time this was made, because we have been compelled by competition to bring things down. For instance, we are selling goods at less to-day than five or six years ago. I cannot answer Mr. Mulock's question unless I know the date when this was made.

681. What was the market price in 1884? I do not know. If I had known before I came I could have found out by looking back at the prices of wool and everything else. I cannot give an opinion. If you take a piece of cloth and manufacture it out of wool, it will cost so much, or so much less, according to the difference in competition. I say these goods have gone down on account of competition.

682. With respect to wool, these goods are cheaper than five years ago? Irrespective of wool; we all know goods are cheaper to-day than they were five years ago.

683. Were they cheaper in 1888 than in 1884? Yes.

By Mr. Wallace:

684. Will you compare those two goods (exhibiting two overcoats) and let me know what you think of the quality of the two? I say that is rubbish (pointing to one of them).

685. What do you mean by that? It is rotten. What else can you call it but rubbish?

686. What manufacture is it—English or Canadian? I do not know.

687. Look at it? I do not think there is anybody in Canada makes anything as tender as that.

MR. WATSON (recalled) and further examined.

By Mr. Bowell:

688. Is this English or Canadian? It has the manufacturer's name on it,—Webb & Co. of London (referring to the coat pronounced to be rubbish by the previous witness).

MR. WILBY.—I have never seen anything like it, and we make as light cloth as anybody.

MR. WILBY (recalled) and further examined.

By Mr. McMullen:

689. Mr. Watson pronounced one cloth pure and another not pure. Is it possible to decide by looking at it in that way, whether it is of poor quality or not? I cannot say. I cannot see through the cloth any more than you can. If I analyze it I can say in a few minutes.

690. It is impossible for a man looking at the cloth to say whether it is made out of pure material or not? No. I cannot tell the proportion of shoddy; but I mean to say that if you give me a piece of cloth and without analysis I cannot say what proportion is in it.

691. Can you tell by looking at it whether there is some shoddy in it or not? Yes; you can tell.

692. Can you tell whether there is any shoddy in it or not; can you tell by taking it in your hand? I could tell if there is a lot of shoddy in it.

693. Can you tell if there is any? If you give me a piece of cloth with five per cent. of shoddy in it I cannot tell.

694. I want to know this from you. I don't want to know whether you can tell the percentage or not. Can you tell if it is pure cloth? I want to say this. There is no manufacturer that can tell the difference between shoddy and pure wool when there is five or ten per cent. of shoddy.

695. Is there some shoddy in this? Yes.

696. MR. MULOOK.—Is that absolutely pure stock?

WITNESS.—I don't know that this is absolutely pure. I think it is not pure. I think there is probably a little shoddy in it.

697. Will you select one free from shoddy? (Selecting a tunic) There is one I say is pure, the same as we have had for the past two or three years.

698. HON. MR. DAVIES (addressing Mr. Watson).—Was that tunic you are speaking of as having no shoddy in it taken out of the stock? That was taken out of our stock.

MR. WILBY.—Now, here, gentlemen, I believe there is no shoddy in that. I can make that cloth and I can put 20 per cent. shoddy in it and no man can tell the difference.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell (addressing Mr. Wilby):

699. This is the first coat that you tell me there is no shoddy in it. This is the Canadian manufacture? I did.

HON. MR. BOWELL.—The rubbish is the English.

MR. J. C. McINTOSH, of Woodbridge, Ont., called and examined.

By Mr. Wallace:

700. What is your occupation? A manufacturer of woollen goods.

701. Look at that overcoat. What manufacture is that? Is that Canadian or English? That is Canadian.

702. What manufacture is that one? The quality of the goods—the English goods—is shoddy goods.

703. What comparison is there between those two in quality and in value ? One is worth about 20 cents and the other is worth 80 cents.
704. These are about the comparative values of the two. Do you know whether this is English or Canadian manufacture ? In my experience I would call it English, as English goods of that description are pretty heavily sized.
705. What with ? With sizing.
706. What is sizing ? Flour sizing and blue sizing.
707. Will you look at that tunic damaged. Can you tell me what manufacture that is ? I could not tell you whether it's English or Canadian distinctly.
708. Can you tell English from Canadian goods ? You can in some classes of goods. It is pretty hard to tell these classes.
709. In that class ? In moety all classes of English goods there is a finish on them more so than on Canadian goods.
710. Is there sizing in that ? There is no sizing of any consequence in that.
711. Is that pure wool or is there shoddy in it ? There is shoddy in it.
712. You think there is a pretty large proportion of shoddy in it ? I could not say what proportion there is in this.
713. Is there any cotton in it ? There is no cotton in it.
714. Did you look at these tunics ? I have not.
715. Did you examine the sealed patterns in the Militia Department in the clothing department ? No, I did not.
716. What goods did you look at ? I saw some patterns in there. I do not know whether they are sealed patterns or not.
717. Were you looking at some English and Canadian manufactured goods ? Yes.
718. What is the respective comparative qualities of the English and Canadian goods of the same classes of goods ? Well, I prefer the Canadian goods.
719. In what way ? From the appearance of them and from the feel of them. I think they are more pure than the English.
720. What about the quality ? I think the quality of the Canadian goods is the best.
721. The Canadian goods were better quality in what way ? Well, seemingly more pure than what the English goods are.
722. Less shoddy ? Less shoddy, of course.
723. Which have the most sizing in them ? The English goods have the most sizing in them. Canadian has no sizing.
724. What about the wearing quality of English and Canadian goods ? I should think the Canadian would wear better.
725. What about the dyes ? The colors in the Canadian, I suppose, would be in the scarlet and would be just as good as the English.
726. What about the other ? I cannot say unless a person tested them. If you put them through a certain test in a certain way that they are tested, you can see whether the dye is indigo, blue or analine.

Lieut.-Col. HOUGHTON, called and examined.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

727. You are Deputy Adjutant General of District No. 5 ? Yes, sir.

728. Will you refer to this letter and tell the Committee if you are the person who signed that letter ? Yes, sir ; I wrote to Mr. Shorey.

729. Will you read it to the Committee so that it may be before them in the evidence ? I will read it.

MILITARY DISTRICT No. 5,

HEAD QUARTERS, MONTREAL, 12th July, 1888.

H. SHOREY & Co., Montreal.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to yours of the 18th inst., asking my opinion in reference to the quality of the material in the serge trousers supplied by you to the Canadian

militia, as well as to the general make up of the same, I have much pleasure in testifying that I have heard no complaints whatever against them in my former district (No. 10), but on the contrary, both officers and men at all times expressed themselves as thoroughly satisfied with them, and appeared desirous of obtaining issues of them in preference to any other make in the militia stores, both on account of the superiority of their cut and the appearance of the material in them, and their durability.

My personal experience in this district has been too short to warrant me in making any statement from my own observations, in reference to this subject since my recent arrival here, but since receiving your letter now under answer, I have taken pains to make inquiries of a number of officers commanding corps here and others who have had good opportunities of forming an opinion in the matter, and so far they have been unanimous in highly extolling the supplies manufactured by your firm, which they all agree in stating to be superior in every respect to any similar articles heretofore served out to them from militia stores.

You are at perfect liberty to make any use you may think fit of this letter, in the department or otherwise, as the truth of my assertions can be easily proved by reference to the officers commanding the various militia corps in Canada who have been supplied with articles of your manufacture.

I am, gentlemen, yours obediently,

C. F. HOUGHTON, Lieut.-Col.,

Deputy Adjutant General Military District No. 5.

By Mr. Davies :

730. What induced you to write this letter? Shorey wrote to me asking me for my opinion, and I wrote him my unbiased opinion. This was shortly after I arrived in my new district.

731. You then only gave him the opinion you had heard from others? No; I gave him my opinion from the district I had just left.

732. Where was that? Winnipeg.

733. What class of clothing does he make? Shorey? Trowsers is what I particularly referred to.

734. To which did you refer? Trowsers.

735. Your own experience was too short to judge in Montreal? Yes; but I have had experience since of the clothing that is manufactured in Canada. I have been in the militia for 17 years as Deputy Adjutant General.

By Mr. Mulock :

736. Do you now reside in Montreal? Yes; I have been there nearly a year. My experience given there in the letter was taken from my previous district.

By Mr. Davies :

737. When did you leave Winnipeg? Last May.

738. What position were you in there? Deputy Adjutant General.

739. How many issues of Canadian clothing had you in Winnipeg? I should say two. I would not be certain. The 90th was formed in 1883 and then they had a full issue of clothing.

740. That would be English clothing? No. I think the first issue they had of Canadian clothing was in 1885, after the rebellion. At the end of 1885 or the beginning of 1886—I would not be sure which.

741. They have not had very many years' experience of that? Not many. They had two.

742. It is only two years that you can speak of? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock :

743. What service is that? Rifles.

744. How long in the regular service do the trowsers last? A year.

745. In the militia how many days in the year are they used? On pay drills only 12; but there is volunteer drill as well.

746. You do not know to what extent they have been used? I know that the 90th had a great deal of volunteer drill. They probably drilled more than double the time they were authorized to be paid.

747. How long did the English trowsers issued to you last? They did not last because they were in the rebellion and were worn into rags. They were only a year old. They got them at the end of 1833 or beginning of 1834; but they were in the rebellion. They were only a little over a year in use.

By Hon. Mr. Davies :

748. You cannot tell how long a pair of trowsers ought to last in the militia? I think they ought to last for some three years. I do not suppose all will last that. I think the Engineers won't last that.

749. You were speaking of two years, under ordinary circumstances they would not be worn out? No.

750. Then you had no such experience to justify you in giving an opinion whether these trowsers will last the life of a pair of ordinary ones? No; I know at the time they spoke highly of them, and they were giving great satisfaction. If a man finds he has worn a pair of trowsers two years and they are still in good order, they will last longer. I think that is a fair test.

The Committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Friday, 29th March, 1889.

Committee met; Mr. J. C. Rykert in the Chair.

Hon. W. E. SANFORD called and examined.

By Mr. Mulock :

751. I believe that you had a contract with the Militia Department in 1886? Yes.

752. You had a contract with the Militia Department in 1886 for the supply of clothing? Yes.

753. That contract, I believe, is here among the papers. When were you appointed to the Senate? On the 12th April, 1887.

754. Was the contract in force at that time? The contract of 1886 was in force at that time.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL.—This is not the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

755. When did you deliver the goods under the contract of 1886?

Hon. Mr. BOWELL.—Unless you can show that these accounts before us cover that contract, you cannot proceed.

Mr. McMULLEN.—If you look at page E—69 in the Auditor General's Report you will find payments for 1886 and 1887.

756. There was money owing to you when you were made a Senator? There was money owing to our firm.

Mr. BOWELL.—The account Mr. McMullen refers to is for police clothing.

757. When were all the goods mentioned and contracted for by the contract of 1886 delivered to the Government? I cannot say positively. I left for Europe during the completion of this contract.

758. They were all delivered before you were made a Senator? They were not.

759. The contract ran on after that during the year 1837? Probably but a portion of that year.

760. I have looked at the correspondence here and I should judge so. Here is a mass of correspondence or rather one side of the correspondence, being principally letters from yourself and your firm during the year 1837, and this correspondence if I can understand it readily shows that the contract of 1886 was being carried out in the year 1837 right on through the whole summer and on to the fall of 1887. Do you remember how that is? The contract whatever it might have been for 1836 was completed during that year. That is the year of 1837.

761. For instance I turn up the correspondence, and I will read you a letter :

"HAMILTON, 28th January, 1888.

"MY DEAR COL. MACPHERSON,— We completed and shipped the last of Mounted Police tunics on the 25th instant, and beg to enclose statement showing balance due on the contract. We shall be pleased to receive your cheque for the same these hard times. We are now engaged in manufacturing the 5,000 infantry tunics, 500 cavalry tunics, 500 cavalry overalls, 500 artillery pants, which have been delayed on account of cloth."

It is to be borne in mind that late on in the fall of 1887, a further contract was entered into. Do you remember that? I do not.

762. It was this contract :—Here is a contract dated 15th November, 1887? Yes; that is a contract with the manufacturing company.

763. That was when your corporation came on? The incorporation was made on the 12th of June, 1887.

764. Then your contracts with the Government consisted first of the contract of 1886, which came to an end and became the contract of the company in June, 1887, and that contract of June, 1887— No; do not make any mistakes. Consulting the highest authority, our instructions were positive that the contract entered into in 1886 must be completed or we should lay ourselves open to difficulties for not completing a contract which was entered into before I was called to the Senate.

765. "We" would lay ourselves open to the difficulties? The company would make themselves liable for damages, if they failed to complete the contract.

766. I was not asking what the consequences would be; but as a matter of history what happened? The contract was made and on the 12th of June, 1887, you stepped out and the company took your place? Yes; but not on this contract. The contract was assigned to Frank Stevens, and you will see the assignment among the papers. (See Exhibit "Q. 32.")

767. Well, then, who carried out the terms of that contract? The firm of Frank Stevens. We manufactured the goods, merely to complete that contract.

768. Who are Frank Stevens & Co.? They are simply the agents for the cloth.

769. Who are the company in Frank Stevens & Co.? I cannot say.

770. This is only said to be with Frank Stevens? I said Frank Stevens.

771. Who composed the firm of W. E. Sanford & Co., of Hamilton, and Frank Steven; this was an assignment to him? Yes.

772. You had a remaining interest in it, notwithstanding this assignment? We had the interest of completing the contract.

773. Did you share any of the profits in carrying it out? We retained exactly the same position in regard to the contracts as before, so far as its results were concerned. The simple object I may say squarely in making that assignment was to avoid, and very necessarily on my part, a question which might arise in regard to public criticism. As I stated before, I was authorized by the highest authority to complete a contract which was necessary in the interest of the country and would make me liable for damages if I neglected to complete it—the contract entered into prior to my being called to the Senate.

774. So you ceased to be the real contractor, but your interest remained exactly the same? Exactly the same.

775. Then this correspondence which is here shows that after the 12th of April, 1887, you continued apparently as theretofore. Correct me if I misunderstand it. As theretofore you continued to correspond in the name of your firm with the Government on the subject? That was a question of clerical error only.

776. All payments appear to have been made and shipments appear to have been made by you under the old firm, and all the payments to be made to you? No. They were all made to Sanford & Co.

777. Are you quite sure about that? I say I am. That is my impression.

778. Here is a letter dated 13th April, 1887. Allow me just to ask some one in the department who is 'C. C.'?

Col. PANET.—That is one of the clerks in the department?

By Mr. Mulock :

779. Here is a letter marked Exhibit "A," dated 13th April, 1887, from W. E. Sanford to Sir A. P. Caron. Is that in your handwriting this letter? Yes.

780. That is "W. E. Sanford for W. E. Sanford & Co." That is your signature? Yes.

781. What is the pencil memorandum upon this letter; you, of course, know nothing of that? No.

782. The memorandum, I suppose, is in the handwriting of one of the officials in the office?

Sir A. P. CARON.—That is the handwriting of Colin Campbell.

By Mr. Mulock :

783. Now, the next letter is 18th April, 1887, from you to the department, which I have marked Exhibit "B." That is a letter from your firm to the department, I believe? Yes.

784. Here is another letter, 6th May, 1887. Is this letter from your firm? Yes; it is marked Exhibit "C."

785. Another letter, 11th May. Is that letter from your firm? Yes, marked Exhibit "D."

786. Here is a telegram, dated 17th May, 1887. Do you know anything about that? I presume that is all right.

787. We will skip over the telegrams. The next is a letter, 27th May, marked Exhibit "E," and the next letter, 21st May, marked Exhibit "F"? Yes.

788. You identify this letter, dated 9th June, 1887, marked Exhibit "G"? Yes.

789. Here is another letter, dated 10th June, 1887, from your company to Col. Panet. Do you identify that letter? Yes, these letters are all here. (Marked Exhibits "H," "I," "K," "L," "M," "N," "O," "P," "Q," "R," "S," "T," "V," "W," "X," "Y," "Z," identified by the witness).

790. You identify the letter dated 27th June? Yes, marked "Exhibit I."

791. I am just passing over them to see if you do not identify any. There is a letter signed by your firm? Yes.

792. That one Exhibit "N" is signed by you personally? Yes.

793. November 10th, 1887, is a letter from your firm to Colonel Macpherson. You identify this letter? Yes.

794. The letter dated 19th November, 1887. Do you identify that? That will be letter marked Exhibit "P"? Yes.

795. The letter dated 19th December, 1887; you identify that? Yes.

796. The letter dated January, 1888? Yes.

796½. This letter is in your own handwriting, signed by yourself? Yes.

797. It encloses a statement of the accounts of the department with you? Yes.

798. Here is another letter dated 12th January, 1888. This, I think, is also signed by you personally? Yes.

799. There is a letter dated 16th January, 1888. You identify this as a letter from your firm? Yes.

800. The letter of 16th January, 1888, you identify that? Yes.

801. That, though signed by your firm, seems to be your own letter personally? Yes.

802. The letter dated 28th January, and another letter dated 9th February, 1888, marked "W" and "X" respectively, you identify these letters? Yes.

803. There is a letter dated 3rd March, 1888. You identify that letter? Yes; that is Exhibit "Y."

804. The letter dated 6th March, 1888, that is Exhibit "Z"? Yes, (Exhibit marked "A1" put in.)

805. There is a letter dated 23rd March, 1888? Yes, that is Exhibit "A2."

806. To that letter there is a memorandum attached (Exhibit "A3,") initialled "W. E. S." Are these your initials? I guess these are.

807. "A3" would be a memorandum from you to the Department of Militia signed with your initials? Yes.
808. The letter of 31st March, 1888, is a letter from your firm, I believe? Yes.
809. The letter 16th April, 1888, is Exhibit "A 5"? Yes.
810. Letter 18th April, 1888, is Exhibit "A 6"? Yes.
811. Letter 26th April, 1888, is Exhibit "A 7"? Yes.
812. Letter 30th April, 1888, is Exhibit "A 8"? Yes.
813. Letter 1st May, 1888, is Exhibit "A 9"? Yes.
814. Letter 3rd May, 1888, is Exhibit "A 10"? Yes.
815. The letter 8th May, 1888, is Exhibit "A 11"? Yes.
816. The letter of 9th May, 1888, is? Exhibit "A 12."
817. The letter of 14th May is? Exhibit "A 13."
818. You recognize this as being from your firm. The letter dated 18th May, 1888? That is Exhibit "A 14." Yes.
819. The letter of the 23rd May, 1888, is? Exhibit "A 15."
820. Letter of 30th May, 1888? Exhibit "A 16."
821. The 1st of June, 1888, is? Exhibit "A 17."
822. The 7th of June, 1888? Exhibit "A 18."
823. Sixteenth June, 1888? Exhibit "A 19."
824. Nineteenth July, 1888? Exhibit "A 20."
825. Twenty-seventh July, 1888? Exhibit "A 21."
826. Twenty-fourth July, 1888? Exhibit "A 22."
827. Twenty-sixth July, 1888? Exhibit "A 23."
828. Thirty-first July, 1888? Exhibit "A 24."
829. Fifteenth September, 1888? Exhibit "A 25."
830. Nineteenth September, 1888? Exhibit "A 26."
831. Twenty-eighth September, 1888? Exhibit "A 27."
832. Exhibit "A 27" is signed by you personally? Yes.
833. The letter of 3rd October, 1888, is? Exhibit "A 28."
834. Twentieth October, 1888, is? Exhibit "A 29."
835. Eighth November, 1888? Exhibit "A 30."
836. Exhibit "A 30" is signed by yourself personally? Yes.
837. The letter of 22nd June, 1889? That is Exhibit "A 31."
838. So that all this correspondence you recognize as correspondence coming from your establishment, as it purports? Yes.
839. To whom were the cheques of the department paid? The cheques of the department? What do you mean?
840. In payment of the account from time to time. Well before 1887, before the assignment of the contract, the cheques were paid to W. E. Sanford & Co. After that period they were paid to Frank Steven.
841. And he paid them over to you? Yes.
842. And he endorsed them over or paid them over? I cannot tell.
843. Did he send the cheques to you? I was away in Europe and do not know.
844. When you spoke of W. E. Sanford & Co., as the first contractors, was there any one in the company but yourself? Not during the last year.
845. When the contract of 1886 was entered into? It was W. E. Sanford & Co., but W. E. Sanford was alone. I was the only contractor.
846. When did it become the manufacturing company? It became the manufacturing company in June.
847. Letters of incorporation were taken? Yes; they were secured at that time.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—Are we going into the history of the incorporation of that company? It a matter of that kind can be investigated by the Public Accounts Committee, I do not see why every other matter should not be brought before this Committee whether it refers to accounts or not. I object to it upon this one ground, because it is taking up such an amount of time that it is quite impossible to keep up the work in my department. I have several of the heads of my department here,

who have been here day after day, and if this is an investigation of public accounts, let it be an investigation of public accounts, but surely we are not going into an examination all about the incorporation of the company of W. E. Sanford, of Hamilton.

MR. MULOCK.—Do you rule the question as inadmissible?

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think it is improper.

848. MR. MULOCK.—Note the objection. I ask whether Mr. Sanford is the principal member of that corporation—during the continuance of this contract, during the time the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company has had these contracts with the Government—were you or were you not? Are not you yourself one of the principal shareholders? Yes.

848½. Now I come to a branch of the case that I raised before. I want to ascertain Mr. Sanford's contributions to the Conservative party.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—I ruled that out before. It is of no interest to the Committee and we have no right to interfere.

849. I put the question and you can rule upon it. Have you made any contributions in money for the welfare or promotion of the Conservative party? Allow me to correct a charge, Mr. Chairman, which he made against me in his introduction, which was to the effect that I, through contracts and realizing largely on these contracts, had contributed extensively in corrupting the constituencies at the last election; I want to reply to that. The contracts entered into was in response to the public call, through, I suppose, every Conservative paper in the Dominion. The contracts were awarded to the lowest contractor and the work entered upon before the time of the election to which he refers. Consequently, I have received no favors and asked no favors from the Government.

850. Do you say there were public advertisements asking for tenders for the contract that was entered into on the 16th of December, I think it is, 1887; I will admit that so far as these papers produced are concerned they show that there was an advertisement for tenders for the contract let in the year 1886; but the departmental officers state that there was no advertisement issued in the press after 1886 for the contracts entered into in 1887? On referring to the columns of the *Spectator* and *The Mail*, you will find that tenders for military clothing were asked for in July, 1884, August, 1886, and December, 1887.

851. The officers say there were no tenders invited so I cannot accept this. The advertisement must be produced? That was in 1888.

852. If I do not recall it rightly, Col. Macpherson will correct me. I asked you, Col. Macpherson, on that point and what did you say?

COL. MACPHERSON.—I said that we advertised for clothing in 1886, and on the 6th August, 1887, we sent out circulars to the parties who had tendered before.

853. MR. MULOCK.—I asked you whether you advertised in 1887?

COL. MACPHERSON.—I stated that we did not, but sent out circulars; that there were only four contractors, and the reason we sent out circulars was to economize and save the expense of advertising. That was for clothing in 1887.

854. MR. MULOCK.—But there was no advertisement in the public press after 1886, for the clothing Mr. Sanford contracted for?

COL. MACPHERSON.—Not for clothing. There was for stores and supplies.

855. MR. MULOCK.—The evidence which Mr. Sanford produces and on which he says the *Spectator* shows there was an advertisement published in 1887, that is a letter signed "W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Co., Limited, Green, Secretary."

MR. SANFORD.—This is the evidence I took:—A gentleman was sent up to the *Spectator* office to make these enquiries, and that is the result of his investigation.

856. You have never seen the advertisements yourself? I know nothing about them.

857. Do you remember on the 15th October, 1888, entering into a contract with the Government to supply them with 9,200 garments of clothing? I do not. I thought that contract was entered into in November, 1888.

858. Do you remember—I have it here November? It is November.

859. Do you remember entering into a contract with the Government or the department for the supply of certain militia clothing? The Sanford Company entered into the agreement—entered into a contract.

860. The prices named in that contract are, I understand, the same prices as were given you under the contract of 1887? If that is your understanding, you are laboring under an error.

861. I am not mixing up 1888 and 1887. The contract prices which you got in 1888 were the same as the contract of 1887? I say no.

862. I think you will find you are mistaken about that. However, the prices speak for themselves. Yes. The figures will speak for themselves.

863. Well, how did you come to know that the Government wanted the goods that you mentioned when you contracted for them in the fall of 1888? I understand that the Government issued a circular letter.

864. I am only asking you how you came to know.

SIR A. P. CARON.—If you will allow the witness to answer. You put a question to the witness, he proceeds to answer it, and you stop him.

WITNESS.—If you want me to answer, I will tell you in so many words, that I was in Europe and have no knowledge whatever as to how our firm knew that we were to contract.

By Mr. Mulock :

865. When were you in Europe? I could not say positively. I left here last May.

866. And returned? And I returned in September, and went immediately to Manitoba. I was in Canada in September, if I remember rightly.

867. I think you said you were in Europe at the time of the contract? Oh, no! You asked the question as to the time of giving notice of the contract. If I remember rightly I was in Europe at that time.

868. You say the contract of 1888 was entered into in November? In November.

869. Where were you? I was in Canada, in Ontario.

870. At your place, attending to business? No; an average of four months in the year is the extreme limit of which I give to a residence in Hamilton, and I am not as intimate with the details of that business as I should otherwise be.

871. Were you giving any attention at all to the business between this company and the Government during the fall of 1888? Yes.

872. You say you were not attending to the business in November, 1888, when this contract was entered into? Oh, no, my explanation to you was this: That when you asked me this question: How did I learn of the notice given that the Government required the goods, I said: If I remembered correctly, I was in Europe at the time they gave this notice; I was in Canada at the time the contract was closed.

873. So, then, you cannot tell, except from what your establishment told you, how there came to be a contract in 1888? No.

874. You were here, Mr. Sanford, attending to business in September, because here is a letter in your own handwriting, dated 28th September, 1888? I told you I returned in September.

875. You were attending to business, then? I was in business then, perhaps, for a week or ten days.

876. Here is a letter in November, 1888. There is another letter from you, that is in your own handwriting? Yes, that is my own signature. The letter is written on a typewriter, but the signature is my own.

877. Exhibit "A 30" says: "My dear Col. Macpherson;—On the 9th of May, 1887, you ordered an additional 500 rifle green tunics, with instructions to prepare for an additional 500 which you would undoubtedly require a little later." Was there any advertisement calling for tenders for the supply of the 500 rifle green tunics mentioned in that letter? No, that is always a part and parcel of the contract.

878. That was a supply under the paragraph in the contract entitling the Government to take an additional 500? Yes.

879. Do you remember whether you did supply an additional 500? I cannot say positively.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

880. Did you tender in 1886, do you remember? Yes.

881. Did you tender in 1887? Yes, in 1885, 1886 and 1887.

882. You tendered in 1887 and obtained a contract in 1887, did you not? Yes.

883. After they asked for tenders, if by circular, or otherwise, the Minister gave you a contract at the price that you asked in your tender? On my return from Europe we were informed that our tender was the lowest tender. They advised me that our tender was the lowest, but that the Minister declined to carry it out.

884. Why? That is what I did not know.

885. Did you ascertain afterwards? I ascertained the reason, which was to this effect, as nearly as I can remember it: I thought at the time it was most unbusiness-like, with all due respect to the Minister. I must say it was quite contrary to all business principles and I understood his reply was this: "It is true the tender of your company is the lowest, but the Government only allow me so much money to clothe so many men, and I cannot do it." That was the reply. I may be mistaken in regard to the exact words, but it is the general effect which I give you. Our company had declined to have anything further to do with it. Then the Minister proposed to us to reduce the figures tendered either 10 or 11 per cent. As near as I can remember it was 11 per cent.

886. He compelled you to lower your tender 10 or 11 per cent., or he would not give it to you? The point was this: we will not do anything further under these contracts unless you reduce 10 or 11 per cent.

887. Did he give you any reason? The reason I previously stated. Then the manufacturers of the cloth came to us and said: we have gone to a very large expense to perfect ourselves in the manufacture of this cloth. Mr. Paton, the head of the Paton Manufacturing Company, was three months in Europe learning how to dye these goods according to the English standard, and they had gone to a large expense in new plant or vats. They said: we will reduce our prices to meet the necessities of the case, although there is nothing in it as it now stands. They made a proposition that they would reduce the prices of their cloths, if I remember right, six per cent.

888. That is the Paton Company? That is the Paton Company and the Rosmond Company also took a similar position and did reduce their prices on the condition that our company would reconsider our intention to withdraw from the work. The makers of the goods came forward and said: we will reduce our prices as we can manufacture these goods at a time when we are idle.

889. You are speaking of the cloths? I am now talking of the makers of the coats, the tailors. These goods are manufactured by two men who made the English standard and I defy you gentlemen to look at a better class of garments than you will see there. Mr. Mulock here is wearing a coat which I suppose would be worth \$1.40 per yard at the mill. The scarlet cloth which was used by our company, paying net cash therefor, was, within a short time ago, worth \$2.00 per yard, if I remember right. I am within a shadow of it when I say so, in any case. The blue either costs ten or fifteen per cent. more—the blue is more expensive. I know there is a difference of ten or fifteen per cent. more.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

890. Is not the scarlet more expensive? The blue is ten or fifteen per cent. more. It is heavier goods. On the strength of the pressure of the manufacturers of the cloth and the manufacturers of the coats, we handed in an amended tender to the Government.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

891. Then I understand you to say that instead of receiving any advantages from anyone, for any reason whatever, the Minister of Militia actually screwed you down to such a point that there is very little profit in it? We resolved not to touch it until the cloth people came forward and said: "We will reduce our price" to enable us to do it. I tell you a fact which I want to have distinctly understood, that with a view to assisting to establish the manufacture of military goods in the

west, to be in a position as we are to-day and the necessity required it—as our company could to turn out five hundred or a thousand of these tunics every week—the margin of a profit upon these suits—some of them, I do not speak of them all—was either 30 or 31 cents per suit. I state this and defy contradiction as to truthfulness.

892. HON. MR. JONES.—You mean 31 per cent?

HON. MR. SANFORD.—No; I mean 31 cents per suit.

893. Having established that, was your contract extended in 1888? The contract of 1888 was entered into by the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company.

894. That was at the prices you had been screwed down to in 1887? Yes; the prices screwed down in 1887. I can also say this to the Minister of Customs, that the Minister of Militia may be a very able military man, but as a commercial man he is a failure.

By Mr. Mulock:

895. Was there no contract issued in reply to your communication of 24th March, 1888. You say: "We will make the long coat of these goods." I should say that your company wrote a letter directed to Col. Macpherson, dated 23rd March, 1888, probably sent to you at Ottawa, and you added this appendix, as it is written on Senate paper, "we will make the long coat of these goods for \$3.80" and so on, and signed "W. E. S." Was there any contract entered into on that? No; I may say that a letter was received from the Militia Department saying that in the hospitals they were suffering for some class of loose garment for the sick, and wanted a few dozen, and would we please send them prices. They sent up a few samples of cloth and our reply was "we will do so and so"; but they did not take advantage of it.

896. Did you enter into any contract for them? Not to my knowledge.

897. Was the clothing you contracted for for the Mounted Police the same as is embraced in the order for cavalry clothing?

Col. MACPHERSON.—That would not be in our department.

898. Did you enter into a contract for the clothing for the Mounted Police? We manufacture for the Mounted Police.

899. That is another contract? Exactly on the same principle.

900. But it is no part of the documents here. It is different from any produced? I do not think so. It is with a different department.

901. When did you enter into the contract for the clothing for the Mounted Police? I really cannot answer that. I presume they were all about the same time.

902. You are not able to speak with any accuracy about the Mounted Police contract? No.

903. Do you remember the number of years? I think it is two years.

By Dr. Ferguson:

904. I would like to ask Mr. Sanford his opinion of the relative value of the cloths in use—the English and Canadian? Our experience is this: The Canadian clothes are all made of pure stuff. When I say that, I mean to say that the very best of Canadian goods that are made of pure stock are better than the English imported goods of the same price. I mean to say that the goods of which this military clothing is manufactured by two houses that are thoroughly known to every dry goods firm in the Dominion as the two largest manufacturers of this material turned out in the Dominion. That is the Rosamond mills of Almonte and the Paton mills of Sherbrooke, Que. Until recently these companies have never introduced shoddy into their manufactory. To have a piece of goods from either of these mills it was a guarantee that it was made of pure wool. As I stated before, the fact that these goods cannot be bought for less than \$2 or more per yard would be an evidence of that.

By Mr. Wallace:

905. Is that \$2 per yard single width? No, double.

L. H. IRVING, of Toronto, called and examined :

By Dr. Bergin :

906. You are a lieutenant in the Queen's Own? No, sir; I am not.

907. Are you in any regiment? I am not.

908. Lieutenant Irving is the man we called for? There is a Lieut. Irving on the retired list.

909. You were in the Queen's Own? No.

910. What regiment were you ever in? The Toronto Garrison Artillery.

911. Were you a lieutenant in that? I was.

912. Do you know anything about this question of clothing supplied to the militia of Toronto? In what way?

913. From your personal knowledge? Yes, sir; I know something about it from personal knowledge.

914. Do you know anything about the strength of the Queen's Own regiment? About 550, I should say, going on to 600.

915. How many companies are there? Ten.

916. What is the strength of each company? Some of them are 55 and some of them run to 60.

917. What is the authorized strength according to law of each company? Forty-two, I believe,

918. Will you explain to the Committee how the other 13 or 18 are clothed; where does the clothing come from? They purchase it, I believe.

919. Who purchases it, the men? The men.

920. Or the officers? The men, I believe. They draw no pay and their pay goes into a fund for supplying them with clothing. All their pay, for officers and men, goes into a fund to keep the regiment supplied with clothing.

921. If the company has been recruited to this full strength authorized by law of 42 men, it recruits an additional number to bring it up to the 55 or so? Yes.

922. Are these men recruited at the same time to the full strength of 42, or at different periods during the year; you were a lieutenant? Yes; of the Toronto Garrison Artillery.

923. How long were you an officer in the service; in the Militia? Three years.

924. Then you have had an opportunity of knowing how men feel, who, when new recruits are brought in, find that their clothing does not compare very well with that of the new recruit. Give us your experience in that respect? We had no old clothing except what we took over from the Toronto Garrison Battery—from Capt. Gibson in 1884. We received all the old clothing of his corps which had been used for three or four years; but the department issued 42 tunics and 42 trowsers, so that all got new tunics and new trowsers. That was in the autumn of 1884.

925. Now we will go back to the Queen's Own. When these additional men join the companies they are provided with clothing, you say, out of the fund contributed by the officers and men, whom, you say, give all their pay for that purpose; they are provided with new clothing? No, sir; I did not say that.

926. Do you give them old clothing? I do not know what they are giving them in the Queen's Own, for a fact, but a very large number of recruits when offered the clothing furnished by the department decline to take them and order their own.

927. That is new clothing? Yes; brand new.

928. Where do they buy it? From the department here.

929. Then, do you mean to say that the clothing which the department issues to the men and which the men refuse to accept, is different clothing from that which the department furnishes upon the payment of money? I cannot say that. I do not know anything about that.

930. Why do they refuse the clothing issued by the department? Dirty and worn out.

931. Do men as a rule keep their clothing in good order and take pride in them? The Queen's Own have the character of being a good corps.

932. How is it in your corps? Our corps is broken up.

933. Do you not know as a fact that men refuse to accept old clothing on joining a regiment—clothing that has been worn by other men; but in violation of the law attach themselves to a regiment and insist on having first-class clothing; that is clean clothing not worn by other men; is that a fact; you have had experience long enough in the regiment to say? That men come and recruit to get the clothing. In our own corps I never had men object to clothing previously issued to the men.

934. Is it not a fact that some men in the companies have new clothing—clothing that has not been worn, or stained, or soiled—while others are worn and soiled? Yes, that is a fact.

935. That creates dissatisfaction? I do not know.

936. But you must know something about it? No. I don't.

937. But you have been three years in the service. Is it not a fact that the new clothing that is issued to the new recruits attached to the company in excess of that allowed by law, causes dissatisfaction with the men who have been regularly enlisted before; that they complain that they have not the same fresh bright clothing that the recruits have and therefore there is dissatisfaction created by the officers who sanction this improper course of proceeding? The recruit does not necessarily get new clothing.

938. You said just now that they would not take the clothing issued by the department; that they must have new clothing. I asked you where they bought them and you said from the department? They declined to accept the uniform which had been previously issued if dirty and worn out.

939. Why, you told me just now they did not? I say they did object.

940. I asked you and you answered distinctly? They objected to partly worn uniforms in the Queen's Own and then they bought their own.

941. You said a moment ago they would not take that clothing, and although they had refused to take the clothing issued by the department, strange to say, they took their own money, and came down here, and bought the same kind of clothing from the department. Will you try and reconcile these two statements, please? What I said was that I believed the men of the Queen's Own declined to take the uniforms apparently worn and dirty and it caused them to go and buy their own uniforms.

942. That is exactly what I have been trying to get out of you all the time. In consequence of this course of procedure they would not take the clothing the officers proposed to give them and they sent down here and bought new clothing from the department. I hope you understand that thoroughly? That is the same remark I just made.

943. You are showing the whole cause of the dissatisfaction of all the people in the regiment, as they have raised the number beyond what is authorized, and the men would accept nothing but new clothing? When you say in excess of what is authorized by law, the Queen's Own got the clothing for forty strong. The ambulance and all the men above those authorized, purchased uniforms out of their own pocket.

944. With the result that you have just pointed out to the Committee. Do you not know that in consequence of the desire of the officers of the Queen's Own to make their regiment the strength of 500 or 600, as you told us just now, that it is really in violation of the rules of the department? Is it, sir? Where does it say there is anything to prohibit the men from enlisting over 42 per company? The company is authorized by the regulation up to 75.

945. Yes, if sanctioned by the department? It is the law, sir, in the regulations.

946. It may, of course, be 75. In cases of necessity the department may order each regiment to be filled up to that extent? Do you wish to look at that, sir?

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

947. Did you say 75? I said 55.

Dr. BERGIN.—I desire to say to the Committee that Mr. Mulock produced some letters and papers the other morning upon which he proposed to base the questions he desired to ask Capt. Bennett. I would ask the Committee for the production of these papers, as it is very important in connection with the questions I propose to put to this witness.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—He read from letters.

Dr. BERGIN (addressing Mr. Mulock)—You asserted in your position as a member of Parliament that you would be able to give important information.

Mr. MULOCK.—“Startling” is the word.

Dr. BERGIN.—I would like to get these papers.

Mr. MULOCK—Any correspondence that comes to me comes to me as a privileged communication. I used them as my instructions and I repeat all I said then. It is the privilege of a member of Parliament to receive communications and keep in confidence the names.

Dr. BERGIN—These papers are not of a character that you can afford to produce them before the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK—It would not be just to the people to publish their correspondence.

By Dr. Bergin :

948. Lieut. Irving, have you had any communication with Mr. Mulock upon this question? I had one letter from him, sir.

949. Have you it with you? Yes, sir.

950. Will you produce it? It does not bear on the subject at all.

951. I ask you in connection with this matter when did you receive that letter? It looks like the 19th of March.

952. Was it in answer to a letter of yours to Mr. Mulock? No, sir, it was not.

953. Had you written any letters to Mr. Mulock in connection with militia matters? No.

954. Is this letter in connection with this enquiry? If it is not in connection with this enquiry we do not want to know anything about it.

955. Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Is it in connection with this enquiry? Yes.

By Dr. Bergin :

956. If there is any part of it in connection with this enquiry I wish it to be read.

Mr. MULOCK—Oh, read it, read. (Witness reads the letter as follows:—)

DEAR IRVING,—On Wednesday we are to have another meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, and I would be glad if you could give me by that time the names of some witnesses to have subpoenaed to prove the following matter:—

In 1888 the Government, without competition, issued to James O'Brien a contract to supply the Government for three years, 1888, 1889 and 1890, a certain quantity of military overcoats (infantry or artillery) of the same pattern, style, material, &c., as previously supplied. The prices given being the same as those paid in 1884. I wish to prove that there has been a shrinkage in prices, if such has been the case, upon which I am assured there is no doubt whatever. Please see Peter Ryan, he may perhaps go and consult with some reliable expert or person in the trade who will be able to give evidence. If you get the name or names please write me Tuesday night so that I will get the letter Wednesday morning. I hear that the Q. O. R. have ordered uniforms from England out of their own pockets, why have they done this?

Yours sincerely, W. MULOCK.

L. H. IRVING, Esq., Toronto.

By Dr. Bergin :

957. You are in the employ of the Provincial Secretary's department in Toronto, are you not? Yes.

958. Can you give the Committee any idea of the reasons that prompted Mr. Mulock to address you particularly to give this information, as you do not happen to

be in the trade, as I see you are employed in the Provincial Secretary's office? What prompted Mr. Mulock to write to me?

959. Yes? I don't know.

960. Have you had any conversation with Mr. Mulock previous to that? Well, I spoke once to Mr. Mulock two or three months ago.

961. About this matter? It was about militia affairs generally.

962. Since your corps has been broken up you have taken a very great interest in militia matters, haven't you? I always did.

963-4. You have not been at all backward in giving your views in connection with the militia? No.

965. Do you know the gentleman in Toronto who writes over the *nom de plume* of "Linch pin"? Yes.

966. Is he a very reliable authority? I have no idea.

967. It is strange that you should know the man and have no idea whether he is a reliable man or not. Can you give me the first letters of his name? It is myself.

Dr. BERGIN.—I have nothing more to ask the witness.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

968. You said that some men that were enlisted in your corps refused to wear the clothing that was furnished by the Militia Department on account of their having been worn and dirty? That is the Queen's Own, sir.

969. Are you not aware now, Lieut. Irving, that the Militia Department never issue clothes that have been worn? I do not wish you to understand that the Militia Department issued the clothing, but issued to the men through the Regimental Quartermaster.

970. That is what I suppose you meant.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—The department never issues second-hand clothing.

By Mr. Mulock:

971. You said your corps was broken up. Why?

Dr. BERGIN.—I object to that question. It is not pertinent to this enquiry. We are now considering the cost of militia clothing.

Mr. McMULLEN.—I should like to know if the question of "Linch-pin" was connected with this matter.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

972. Do you know anything about contracts for clothing which have been given by the Militia Department to Mr. Sanford or anyone else in the years 1886, 1887 or 1888? No, sir, I know nothing whatever about it.

973. Do you know anything of the quality of the clothing that has been furnished by this contractor? I know nothing about the clothing supplied by any one contractor, but I have heard of the complaints and we have had experience in our own battery about the clothing. We have no idea who was the maker of the clothing or where it was manufactured.

974. Do you know whether too much was paid for this clothing and whether it could have been obtained cheaper? From an enquiry which I made last Saturday I was told that the prices were too high.

By Mr. Mulock:

975. What is the average life of an English tunic in the regular service? I cannot tell you that. They are issued to last two years.

976. In the regular service the tunic is expected to last two years? Yes; rank and file.

977. How often to be worn? Every day.

978. Do you know anything about the present condition of any of the uniforms in the Queen's Own of the issue of, say, 1887. How do they compare with the issue of ten years before, say 1878. Do you write on militia matters to the *Empire* or to other papers; I think I have seen "Linch Pin" in the *Empire*. What answer do you make to the question of the relative appearance of uniforms in 1878 and 1887 and now in use? There are tunics now being worn in the Queen's

Own which were issued in 1878, and the Queen's Own band uniform, which was issued in the fall of 1887, is now worn out.

979. What was the condition of the uniforms issued to the Queen's Own in 1878? They are still wearing them.

980. How does that compare with the uniforms issued in 1887? The band clothing in the Queen's Own, issued in the fall of 1887, is now worn out.

981. How about the issue of 1887 to privates and not to the band? Well, sir, I went into the master tailor's of the Queen's Own, Mr. Crean, last week, and he had a tunic worn by private Bums, the drill instructor, a most careful man, a clean man, and this tunic was issued in May, 1887. It is now worn out. Mr. Houston, the partner in the firm, looked at the cloth and said it was a green re-dyed. It was blue cloth.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—Mr. Mulock will not insist on that being evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN.—No evidence of that kind can go into the report.

982. I am told that the measurement stamp of some of the uniforms now in use is not accurate as to the size. Have you any experience in that? I took the measurement of a tunic about to be altered. It was stamped as 41 around the chest and 39 around the waist. The cutter measured it and it came to 44 around the chest and 42 around the waist.

983. Do you know how long cloth trowsers, issued to the Royal Artillery, Regulars, are expected to be worn? They get a cloth pair, a serge pair, and a canvas pair. They are supposed to last a year, that is the three.

984. Have you ever inspected the stores here in Ottawa before they have been issued? Yes, sir.

985. Where? Down here in the stone building by the canal.

986. The Government building? Yes.

987. When did you see them there? Last year, during 1888.

988. Who was present at the time? Col. Macdonald, of Guelph.

989. Who was in charge? I do not know who was in charge, but we saw Mr. Watson, the inspector of stores.

990. That is the gentleman sitting behind you? Yes.

991. What did you see there in regard to clothing. Did you look at any of the clothing? Mr. Watson showed us all the new issue, and told us that the Canadian clothing was much superior to the English.

992. Did you make an examination yourself? No, sir.

993. Do you know anything about the color? Of the new ones in store?

994. Old or new, either? After we had seen the clothing, he said, "I want to show you a pair of trowsers," and he showed us a pair of trowsers which were originally supposed to be blue. The front part was a red color, a claret color, and the back part was blue and that was a reddish color.

995. This had been issued? Yes; and returned.

996. Have you ever noticed the color of the uniforms as worn by the men. Take our Toronto companies. Are the colors uniform and true as far as you have observed? I have only seen them by gas light.

997. And cannot speak? No.

998. Do you know Color Sergeant Kells, of Toronto? No, sir; I do not.

999. Do you know Mr. Crean? Yes, sir.

1000. Who is he? Master tailor of the Queen's Own.

1001. Has he had the handling of the clothing issued by the department to the Queen's Own? Yes; if there is any altering to be done, I think he does it.

1002. Would he be a competent witness to give us evidence as to the character of the cloth? Yes; he is a tailor and has been in the militia and knows about the cloth itself.

1003. You do not know Mr. Kells? I know him personally. I thought you asked me about his uniform.

1004. You know Color Sergeant Kells, of the Queen's Own Rifles. Yes.

1005. How long has he been in the service? I do not know.

1006. Is he qualified to give evidence here? Color Sergeant McKell his name is.

1007. I should have said McKell? I heard he bought a tunic and pair of trowsers.
THE CHAIRMAN.—Never mind about what you heard.

1008. Do you know whether he has made any examination into the clothing?
 I believe he has.

1009. Do you know what he has done? He imported a tunic and pair of trowsers from England.

1010. For himself? Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.—You do not know.

The WITNESSES.—He told me so.

By Mr. Wallace:

1011. You got a letter from Mr. Mulock, asking you to see Mr. Peter Ryan. Did you see him? Yes; I saw him.

1012. What arrangement did you make with him? I did not make any arrangement with him. He wrote a letter, I believe.

1013. Did he arrange to go and see any party. Did Mr. Peter Ryan make any arrangement with you that he would go and see any other person? He sat down and began writing a letter.

1014. Did he say he would see Mr. Wilby? No; he said "I will write Mr. Mulock a letter."

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

1015. You said you saw a pair of trowsers which was one color in front and another behind. You said it had been issued and returned. Are you sure of that? Yes.

1016. Do you know whether that was Canadian clothing, this tunic you referred to as having been too large; two inches too large, or rather improperly marked. Was that the English or Canadian? They told me it was Canadian.

1017. Who told you? Mr. Crean.

1018. You do not know that of itself? He turned the tunic over and said it was of Canadian make.

1019. Have you been appointed by the different corps to investigate the clothing? No, I have not.

1020. It is more to satisfy your own curiosity? Yes.

1021. Do you know whether the issue of clothing you spoke of having taken place in 1887 was of Canadian or English manufacture? In 1887—The Queen's Own?

1022. Yes? They were Canadian.

1023. How do you know? They were stamped.

Mr. WILBY recalled and further examined.

By Mr. Wallace:

1024. Whom did you see with reference to the quality of the cloth? Peter Ryan.

1025. What did he want you to prove? He did not ask me to prove anything. He asked me with reference to the relative values of the cloth, and the shrinking of values and what I thought about it for the last five years.

1026. What else did he ask you? That is all.

1027. Simply on the shrinkage in values? Yes.

1028. Did he ask you to come down to Ottawa? I did not mention Ottawa and he did not mention militia clothing.

1029. It was just in reference to the general shrinkage in the values of cloth? Yes.

The Committee then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 11th April, 1889.

Committee met; Mr. Rykert in the Chair.

J. S. CREAM, of Toronto, called and examined.

By Mr. Mulock:

1030. You are in the Queen's Own, I believe? Yes, sir.

1031. What is your rank? I am second lieutenant.

1032. How long have been in the Queen's Own? Since 1877, the spring of 1877.

1033. What company? I am attached to "I" Company.

1034. You say you entered the Queen's Own in 1877? Yes, sir.

1035. As what, a private? Yes, sir.

1036. And have you served continuously ever since in the regiment? Yes, sir.

1037. In what capacity? I have been private, sergeant, color-sergeant and sergeant major.

1038. And now you are a commissioned officer? Yes.

1039. What is your business? My business is that of a merchant tailor and military outfitter. That is, I am in partnership.

1040. That is the business you are carrying on? Yes, sir.

1041. Do you carry that business on in Toronto? Yes, sir.

1042. How long have you been carrying on that business? I succeeded to my father's business. He started business in 1874, and I went into business with him. He is now dead and I am carrying on the business myself with a partner.

1043. Ever since you have been in the service? Yes, sir.

1044. Have you had an opportunity of seeing the character of the clothing of the Queen's Own? Yes, sir; I have seen a great deal of it.

1045. What is your opinion of it. My opinion of the clothing that is issued now, is that it is exceedingly bad; very bad.

1046. In what respect? The material is bad. The cut is bad. It is impossible to get a tunic to fit a man. The tunics are not cut and made up according to the measurements. The material is bad and it is not always of the same color. I have seen tunics made up of different colored cloth.

1047. Different colors in the same tunic? Yes, sir.

1048. You said something about measurement. What do you mean by that? A tunic is marked to measure so many inches around the breast, and so many inches in the waist and also the height of the man. There is a certain proportion according to the length of a military garment. For instance, a rifle tunic to fit a man, say 5 feet 8 inches, should have a skirt 9 inches long, and the waist should be of the proper length and size to fit naturally when he wears a belt. I have very seldom come across a tunic, in fact I do not remember coming across a tunic that came up to measurement. It was too large and necessitated a great deal of altering to fit the man as well as a great deal of expense.

1049. On whom does the expense fall? The privates and non-commissioned officers, and those in the case of the band on the officers.

1050. What proportion of tunics have to be altered to fit? We altered and trimmed the tunics for the Queen's Own band a year ago last fall. There were some 40 men in the band and every tunic had to be altered. We remarked it at the time that there was not a single tunic that had not to be altered.

1051. Why was that? They are not cut in proportion. A man that the tunic would fit, would be too large around for service. A man who is fit to be a soldier would not be big enough around the waist to fit the tunic. They are cut out of proportion and would only fit large men of mature years. In every single instance the tunics were altered more or less. There was not an exception.

1052. What do you mean by "without a single exception"? Every single case. I mean there wasn't an exception.

1053. How about the tunics issued to the privates? They are exactly the same. As a rule our men are young men and are not filled out as well as the bandsmen. The bandsmen are older men and stouter men as a rule and their tunics require the same alteration. Of course the tunics of the boys require to be altered a great deal, but I am speaking now of the men, the grown men.

1054. You spoke of there being different colors in the same tunic? Yes, sir.

1055. Are the tunics often of the uniform color? No, they are not.

1056. What is your experience in that?

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1057. I would like to know what tunics you refer to. They may be the tunics of ten years ago? I am speaking of the tunics that were issued to us when we got back from the North-West in 1885. Previous to that the tunics were better. At least I had two tunics myself previous to 1885, and they were good tunics, and the tunic I got when I came back in the fall of 1885 was a very bad tunic.

By Mr. Mulock :

1058. What has your experience been since 1885? They are the same, sir. Very bad.

1059. Your remarks apply to all issued since 1885? All I have seen since 1885.

1060. What proportion have you seen since 1885 of this issue? How many since 1885 passed through your hands? A great many.

1061. Why did they pass through your hands? We do the officers' work. We are military outfitters and we do the officers' work for the different regiments all through the country, especially in Toronto, and the men naturally come to us. And the officers of the Queen's Own send their bandsmen and buglers to us to get their clothing altered and the men come to us. We do a great deal of it. I see a great deal of it.

1062. Since your return from the North-West you have had a quantity of the issue since that time to the Queen's Own pass through your hands for alteration? Yes, a great deal of it.

1063. Then, do the remarks that you have just made, in regard to the quality, fit or misfit, color or irregularity in colors—do these remarks apply to the issue since 1885? Yes, sir.

1064. To the issue generally? That is what I understand.

1065-66. Do you know what the character of the uniform was that was issued prior to 1885, I understand that one time the Queen's Own were served with English-made uniforms? Yes, sir. We ordered them and fitted out the Queen's Own band in 1878 and also a few years later, and they were fitted out with English tunics, and 50 per cent. of them fitted without alteration. Others had to be altered but it was a fair proportion. We could take out about 50 per cent. of them that would fit the men without alteration.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1067. 1878? Yes, sir, I think it was 1878, about that year. It was a new issue and we have fitted out the Queen's Own band three times altogether. The last time was a year ago last fall. That was the time I referred to that the tunics did not fit. Every tunic had to be altered. I had personal superintendence of it.

By Mr. Mulock :

1068. How does the cloth in the present issue of tunics compare with the cloth of the English clothing? It does not compare at all. It is very much poorer quality.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1069. Are you speaking of the officers? No, sir; the officers are not issued.

By Mr. Mulock :

1070. How does the color of the present issue compare with the color of the English clothing? Well, the color of the present issue, I have seen some tunics black and some blue and some green. The English tunics were what is termed a rifle green, which is the proper color. It is a peculiar green, you might call it a bottle green. It is the regular color, a rifle green. These were the right color—the English ones.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1071. You are the master tailor in Toronto? No, sir; my father was master tailor of the Queen's Own, but I am not.

1072. You are a merchant tailor? Yes, sir.

1073. And you are a military outfitter? Yes, sir.

By Mr. Mulock :

1074. I was going to ask the cost of altering. What is the average cost of altering a tunic for a private of the Queen's Own to make it fit him? The average? Some tunics have cost as high as \$2.50 and some about \$1.00. I should say the average cost would be \$1.75 to \$2.00. If a tunic has to be altered at all it has to be taken to pieces.

1075. It is paid for by whom? If a man brings in his tunic to be altered he pays for it himself; but if a tunic is brought in for the band the officers pay for it.

1076. There is no public fund that a private's uniform is paid for out of? No, sir; they pay the money to us.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1077. I was about to ask you if it was not a fact that all the altering of the tunics for the Queen's Own is done by you? All of the altering?

1078. Yes? No, sir, I would not say all the altering.

1079. I understood you to say that all the tunics that were to be altered were sent to you? No; if a man chooses to go to some other tailor he is at liberty to do so. We alter for the regiment anything that is to be done regimentally; as for instance the band tunics. They are sent to us. We alter the non-commissioned officers' uniforms and put the chevrons on.

1080. As a matter of fact don't most of them go to you? A great many of them do.

1081. And within your experience of altering these tunics I understood you to say that you had never found one single tunic that fitted according to size? I said, sir, in the instance of altering the band uniforms a year ago last fall, that every tunic was altered. In that instance there were at least 40 tunics and every tunic was altered more or less.

1082. But before you spoke of the tunics of the band you stated that the fit of our Canadian issue was very bad; very poor? Yes, sir.

1083. And you said within your experience—and you spoke of the size of the skirt and waist and all that—that you never found one tunic to fit according to size? I beg your pardon, sir. It is quite possible for a man to get a Canadian tunic to fit him; but I tell you this: I have measured some of them and I have never yet found one that stood the measurement.

1084. Do you still believe that it was within a possibility that a tunic could be made in Canada that would fit? It is possible. It is quite possible, of course, if you get a man with a good big circumference, the tunics I have seen he would fill out, but I question if you would get a waist belt to fit him.

1085. That depends on the size, and the sizes that came out from England are exactly the same as our sizes? I think, sir, they are cut in better proportion in England. You will understand the tunic has to fit tight in the waist for the waist belt. It has to fit as tight as possible in the waist and easy in the chest.

1086. Do you know the value of our tunics? I know what we pay for them—any extra tunics we require.

1087. How much? Six dollars fifty.

1088. And you charge on the average about \$2 for altering them? It depends upon the alteration, sir. We pay our men by time. Our tailors get paid 20 cents an hour, and it depends upon the time he takes.

1089. Still, that is what you stated, that the average is about \$2? The average alteration would be \$1.75 or \$2.

1090. How many would you alter per annum, about how many would you? It would be hard to say just at present. I think we have about a dozen of them in the store at present; of course in drill season when there is an issue of new clothing, there is a great deal to be done.

1091. Taking a year for instance, how many would you fit? I don't think it would be outside the mark to say that we alter 100 tunics in a year.

1092. One hundred tunics in a year? Yes, sir, I think we alter quite that. That would be an average of two a week, and I think we alter quite that.

1093. Well, now you have spoken of the English tunics? Yes, sir.

1094. And you have spoken of the issue of 1885. Now, I would like you to tell me, if you can state so, whether the tunics coming from England, within your experience, have to be altered or not? Oh, yes; some of them have. That is what I said before. I said the Queen's Own band, as I gave you the instance, when we altered their uniforms twice before, that they were English tunics, and about 50 per cent. only had to be altered.

1095. In the case of Canadian tunics? Every one, sir.

1096. That goes against the possibility of one tunic fitting made in Canada? It was a good test. There could not have been a better test of the tunics fitting the men.

1097. I believe you have expressed the opinion, Mr. Crean, that the cloth—you consider the cloth of a very poor quality? Yes, sir, I do indeed.

1098. And you have said that it was not as good as the cloth that comes out from England? It is not as good as the cloth of the English tunics we had before. It certainly is not.

1099. Will you tell me what issue you referred to in expressing that opinion? Well, the first issue I saw of Canadian tunics was the issue of tunics we got in the fall of 1885, after we came back from the North-West. Previous to that, I think, there may have been some Canadian tunics. But I don't remember. I know myself I had two tunics before, and that they were English tunics, and very good ones.

1100. Are you prepared to state that the tunics of the issue of 1885, were Canadian tunics? Yes, sir.

1101. Are you quite prepared to state that? Yes; I know I wanted a tunic myself, and I went through them and got a tunic, and as far as I remember all the tunics were Canadian. They were black cloth, very rough.

1102. In the case of the Queen's Own, which is one of the crack regiments, I understand, you are very particular about the fit of your tunics? Well, sir, of course, a soldier wants to look neat and smart. Our men don't want to turn out guys. They want to turn out as soldierly as possible.

1103. They want a good tailor to fit their tunics properly? Yes, they show good taste. Of course, I presume they come to us because we flatter ourselves we can do the thing properly.

1104. I have no doubt you can. You have stated that the issue of 1895 was of Canadian tunics? Yes.

1105. Canadian made and Canadian cloth? Yes, sir.

1106. Will you state from what source you get this information? I was told so and if I remember right, in fact I am almost positive, the name of the maker was on the leather tab or stock.

1107. Who told you this? It was the general impression. I think it was stated in the papers if I remember rightly. I know it was the general impression that it was Canadian clothing, and I am positive from my knowledge of cloth and knowledge of clothing generally that the tunics we got in 1885 were Canadian.

1108. Can you remember any person who told you that they were Canadian? No; I would not say that.

1109. Had you a chat about that time with Captain Bennett? At that time—Oh, no, I cannot say I ever spoke to Captain Bennett about the clothing. I met him after he had been down here, but we entered into no conversation particularly about the clothing.

1110. You are quite sure there was a name on the tab? It is a very hard matter to remember, and I would not be very sure, but my impression at the time was that it was a Canadian tunic. My old tunic was very good for parade and I would not have taken this new one, but I went up to the Infantry school for a course and took it.

1111. You got new clothing after you returned from the North-West? Yes, sir. The old clothing was worn out.

(The witness was here handed two tunics.)

1112. Will you tell me what you think of these two tunics? Which is the best cloth and tell me if you see anything particularly wrong in the cloth or measurement? That is the same as I saw lately. The tunics of 1875 were a blacker color and of rougher cloth; but I do not consider that is a serviceable cloth.

1113. Is that an improvement on the issue of 1885? I do not know. I do not think much of it anyway. Anyone can see that that is a harder cloth.

1114. Which is the best according to your judgment? This is the best tunic I have no doubt. I see by the name that this is an English tunic. At any rate you may say that this is a Canadian tunic, but it is English. It looks as if a tab may have been taken off and some other one put on. This was not put on by a tailor. I consider that tunic is English.

1115. Why? Because I consider it is good cloth.

1116. Have you seen no good tunic cloth in Canada? No; not in Canada.

1117. Look at the scarlet? This tunic has a Canadian maker's name on it and this other is the English. But this tunic with the Canadian maker's name on it is a better tunic, I consider myself.

By Mr. Watson:

1118. Do you mean to insinuate that the tabs have been altered? I did not say so. That is the best tunic, it is a better tunic than the other one. It is the best Canadian tunic I have ever seen, sir, if it is Canadian.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

1119. Do you think it is Canadian?

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

1120. You have expressed your opinion about that tunic. Do you consider that a Canadian tunic or an English tunic? Well, sir, it is good enough to be an English tunic.

1121. And too good to be a Canadian? It is better than any Canadian tunic I have ever seen, sir.

1122. I think your experience has been with English-made tunics? We have had experience with English-made tunics. Previous to 1885 I think it was all English-made tunics.

1123. Will you tell me what you think of this cloth (tunic produced)? I think, sir, if the tunics were made out of that cloth there would be a big improvement in the tunics we see now.

By Mr. Bowell:

1124-25. Which is the better sample of the two? I prefer this tunic, as I said before. I certainly do. It does not matter to me. I would like to see Canadians make good cloth.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

1126. They are not able to? If this is a Canadian tunic, sir, as far as the material goes that tunic is all right. I wish we had as good tunics in the Queen's Own, as good material.

1127. If they were so good you could not alter them? I am interested in the regiment about altering the clothing.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

1128. Which of those are the best? (Two greatcoats shown.) I know that is not a Canadian cloth.

1129. Which is the better cloth? I think, as a greatcoat, that this will make a warmer coat than this. In regard to the wear of a greatcoat there is great warmth in this. If you could get a good warm greatcoat—

1130. Which do you consider the best? I think this is quite as warm a coat as that. I think it is a good serviceable greatcoat. It is Canadian I know. I can tell without looking at it.

By Mr. Hesson :

1131. He said he never saw any good Canadian cloth ? I beg your pardon, sir, I mean good Canadian tunic cloth.

By the Chairman :

1132. Is that cloth good ? That cloth is not bad by any means. It is the best Canadian cloth I ever saw, and I think if tunics were made out of it, it would be all right.

1133. Will you tell me what your opinion is about these two samples of trowsers ? We use the serge trowsers.

1134. I want your opinion about the cloth ? Do you mean for good serviceable trowsers.

1135. Yes ? Those are rifle trowsers, and those are infantry. I think for serviceable trowsers to stand good wear, this serge is better than that cloth. Serge will stand harder wear than that cloth.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1136. What would be the cost of making one of those tunics ? What would you charge ? Our business is entirely different. In the factory they employ girls, but in our business we employ none but the best workmen—men who get high wages.

1137. What would you make one of those tunics for ? What we would charge would be more than it would be worth. We have not the facilities. You can understand that in making ready-made clothing, the thing is got down to a system.

1138. You remind me very much of the woman whose daughter went to give evidence. She said : " Now Sal, don't acknowledge anything." It seems to me you are following the same plan.

By Dr. Ferguson, of Welland :

1139. Will you tell me what proportion of men take back clothing which they have made in an ordinary tailor shop. I have had some experience in getting clothing. What proportion of the clothing, of coats and trowsers that you make for civilians, have to come back to the shop to be fitted ? Well, sir, certainly there has to be a certain amount of altering ; but what I say about military clothing is —

1140. Is there a percentage ? Yes, sir, certainly.

1141. Is there not a large percentage ? No ; not by any means.

1142. We have all had experience of getting clothes made by tailors, and we simply want your opinion. Is there not a considerable percentage of coats and pants and vests made in a tailor shop, after basting and fitting and being sent from your shop, that are returned to be altered ? There are some, but not a considerable percentage. We have some people that tailors term cranks, that have to have their clothing. We have a list of those men, and we don't take orders from them.

1143. Are there not quite a percentage of the clothes that you send out—I presume that your customers are not all cranks if the volunteers are, are there not a percentage of the coats that you send from your shop that would come back ? There is a percentage, sir, but it is very small.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1144. Let me go back to that question again—supposing I wanted 100 tunics made out of that cloth, what would you deliver them for ? That is what I would like to know ? 100 would not pay you to touch them, sir.

1145. 10,000 then ? I would go around and get hold of some girls willing to work for 50 cents a day.

1146. I asked you what you would do it for. I asked you what you would do it for ? If we were going to tender for a contract of 10,000 tunics I would have to go into it carefully. Our men would charge \$6.50 for making them. Our men are first class tradesmen.

1147. How much for making a hundred of them ? They would not do it any less. We have a union among the tailors.

1148. How much for 1,000 ? It is a question between ready made clothing and merchant tailoring, two different things.

1149. If you were making 1,000 what would you charge? I would go down to some manufacturers of ready made clothing and ask them what they would do it for.

1150. What answer would you give? I will let you know in an hour.

1151. You said in the first place that a first-class tailor would charge you \$6.50 for making? At least that, sir.

1152. How much cloth would you require to make a tunic? A yard and a half for a tunic.

1153. How much? A yard and a half of double width cloth.

1154. That cloth is worth \$2.00 a yard? That would be \$3.00.

1155. And trimmings how much? I consider that the trimmings of the tunic would not cost more than from 60 to 75 cents, sir.

1156. Of course these bone buttons are very cheap? And very cheap braid.

1157. I am informed, however, that the trimmings of a coat like that, of course I am not speaking from my own knowledge—you say 60 cents? I say from 60 to 75 cents. I don't think I would be very far out, sir. That sort is very cheap. There is very little to do and then the lining, it is common sleeve lining.

1158. There is \$3.50 for cloth and trimmings? It would be \$3.75.

1159. Then it would be delivered; how much? Are you reckoning that at the price I would charge. I would not trim a tunic up like that. I don't keep such stuff in the place. We don't keep any such bad stuff.

1160. That would be \$10.25 you would charge for that coat? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock:

1161. You mentioned that the cause of the misfits was owing to a want of symmetry as you might call it? Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

1162. Do you know what those coats cost the department delivered? No, sir; I do not.

By Mr. Mulock:

1163. Would you take up those two tunics that the inspector showed you? (Looking at the inside of the skirt.) That is 6 feet lin., 40 inches breast and 35 inches waist. (Measures with a tape line.) That tunic stands 37 inches waist.

1164. What is it marked? 35. That is just what I say. That tunic would have to be altered, for although it is 35 inches stamped it measures 37.

By Inspector Watson:

1165. Do you mean to say that indicates the exact size of a man. Don't you make an allowance in taking a measurement in that way? If we measure a man 35 inches around the waist we would cut his tunic that.

1166. Would you make no difference. If you took a man 5 feet, 9 inches, and 40 inches breast, do you mean to say you would make it exactly that figure and not make any allowance? I would cut it exactly.

1167. Take that coat that is on you or on that gentleman and the very same proportion would exist as between that tunic and what you say. It is a well defined fact and I can show you the instruction that there is 3 inches allowed between the breast measurement and the actual measurement. The cloth is cut 3 inches larger than the man's measurement. We would allow a good inch for the seams, but when made up it would stand the measurement.

By Mr. Mulock:

1168. Measure that tunic in any other way? It is a very hard matter to measure them in the breast, but in the waist you could measure it easily. This tunic is marked 40 and 35.

1169. Forty means the chest? Yes.

1170. And 35 means that this measures 35 and not the man? It is marked that it measures that.

1171. What does that mean? That it measures 35 inches.

1172. You found that it measures 37? Yes, sir.

1173. Now take that other tunic?

By Mr. Mulock :

1174. How much do you take off the length of the tunic for the circumference of the man. For instance take this tunic 35 inches ?

MR. WATSON.—We allow three inches in the waist and there is a difference of three inches in the chest and that represents the size of the man, not the size of the tunic. I venture to say if you will put that on the same sized man it will fit him.

MR. MULOCK.—Mr. Watson, will you tell me what this is ?

MR. WATSON.—5 8., 39. 3. Now, let that gentleman measure that tunic.

THE WITNESS.—That tunic measures 35 inches around the waist.

MR. MULOCK.—It is marked 34.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1175. Do you know, Mr. Crean, whether the issue of 1885 was made in Canada or in England—that is the issue to which you referred as being of inferior cloth? In Canada, sir.

1176. Do you know by whom? I could not say. It was a Canadian tunic. I drew mine from the company's stores and I knew it was a Canadian tunic.

SENATOR SANFORD.—May I state that we made no tunics in 1885.

By Mr. Bowell :

1177. Mr. Crean, now do you know what is the feeling in the whole regiment ?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—I object to it. We have had the sizes of tunics measured and all that, and it seems to me we are not going into a history of the dissatisfaction of the forces in Canada.

By Mr. Mulock :

1178. You think the defects you speak of affected the condition of the regiment ?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—That again I object to. Mr. Crean has expressed his opinion about the sizes and make of the tunics. I should like to know whether Mr. Crean can be asked to express his opinion about the effect of a tunic marked 35 and measuring only 34—the effect of that mismeasurement upon the militia force of Canada. It is absurd. The hon. gentleman knows it is not a question he ought to put.

MR. MULOCK.—I didn't ask any such question as that.

DR. HICKEY.—It is exactly what he meant.

MR. MULOCK.—Here is a point I submit to you, Mr. Chairman. This witness has stated here that the whole issue of uniforms to the Queen's Own has been unsatisfactory in their fit, and the men have had to come to him to get the clothing altered, and he has had no less than 100 a year to make repairs and alterations to. Now, he is in the regiment, and I think it is pertinent to this inquiry what the effect of the general misfitting and complaints that he speaks of have had on the morale of the regiment.

THE CHAIRMAN.—We are not here to inquire that, Mr. Mulock.

MR. MULOCK.—You won't allow that question to be put ?

THE CHAIRMAN.—No; I think not.

MR. MULOCK.—Let me put it and let it be ruled out.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—I object to it.

MR. MULOCK.—Let the question be put before you rule it out.

1179. What is the effect on the Queen's Own ?

THE CHAIRMAN.—That is objected to.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—I always understood that if objection is taken to a question and the chairman rules that that evidence should not be allowed, it does not go into the evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN.—It goes out of the evidence.

MR. MULOCK.—There can be no evidence until there is an answer, and if that rule were correct, a chairman could sit and—not that I am suggesting it would likely happen, but merely to show what is possible—say “I will not allow that to be put down,” and the whole evidence would be silent as to the question put. I submit that if the question would be eliminated the time to do it is to prevent the witness answering; otherwise, a chairman could entirely stifle an investigation, and there would be no evidence to show what direction the examiner had sought to take.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL.—I think the question put by Mr. Mulock, as to the effect of any policy, or anything that has been done by the Government, is very fair if he wants to condemn the Government in general principles, or for their acts, or anything they have done. We are here, however, as the Public Accounts Committee, and want to know whether the Government has misappropriated the money for militia clothing. If he is to ask this gentleman what his opinions are, and the opinions of the public generally, there is no necessity of confining the question to the clothes alone, but you might go into the question of what he thinks of the general policy of the Government with reference not only to militia matters, but anything else. It is turning the whole matter of this investigation into ridicule.

Mr. MULOCK.—Make a note of the fact that the chairman rules out of order the question as to whether any dissatisfaction exists in the regiment on account of the clothing.

By Mr. Taylor :

1180. I want to get from this witness what time this issue of tunics was delivered in Toronto that were given to the Queen's Own? I could not say, I am sure, sir.

1181. You say in 1855 after your return from the North-West? If I remember right, we came across some clothing on the banks of the Saskatchewan, which was brought home with us.

1182. What time of the year was that issue of 1855? It was in the fall.

1183. Yes; what month? In September or October. That is the company's clothing were issued from the Quartermaster's stores. And when the Quartermaster's stores got there I don't know.

1184. You don't know when they went into the Quartermaster's stores? No, I have nothing to do with that.

1185. They were issued from the Quartermaster's stores in Toronto, in September or October, 1855? Yes.

1186. Do you know when these came from the department here to the stores in Toronto, when they arrived there? No, sir, I don't know.

1187. Had they been in Toronto for some time previous? I don't know.

1188. You say they were of Canadian make? Yes.

1189. You know that? The tunics I saw issued to my company were certainly Canadian-made tunics.

1190. By what firm? I could not say.

1191. How do you know they were of Canadian make? By the material and by the make of the tunics.

1192. You think you are competent to judge these from their make? How so?

1193. They would not make as bad in England? Oh; they can make bad clothing there.

1194. Were they made by the Sanford Manufacturing Company? I could not say.

1195. Were they made by O'Brien & Co., of Montreal? I could not say.

1196. Or Shorey, of Montreal? I don't remember who the maker was.

1197. Or Doull & Miller, of Halifax? I don't remember the maker.

1198. These are the four contractors I am naming over? I could not say. If no one else in Canada but these firms, I presume it is one of them if there are only four in Canada.

1199. I am prepared to prove that none of these men delivered any clothing until 1886. That is the fact of the case. There was none of the clothing supplied by any of these contractors until 1886. That is why I want to get him definitively as to how he knows they were Canadian.

THE CHAIRMAN.—He does not know.

By Mr. Taylor :

1200. Then the only knowledge you have that they were Canadian make is their general style and your own knowledge of the cloth? From my own knowledge as a woollen man and a tailor.

1201. You said a while ago you knew from the brand and from what some people had told you? I beg your pardon I didn't say so. I didn't take hearsay at all.

1202. You said the people told you and from the brand on the tag? I think the hon. Minister asked me how I knew the Canadian cloth was being made.

1202½. It was Canadian cloth and you knew it was Canadian cloth and you said the brand on the tag? I can tell cloth, where English, whether it had a tag or anything else on it.

By Mr. Somerville:

1203. Are you a Canadian? I have lived in Canada since I was four years of age.

1204. You have no great prejudices against Canada or anything Canadian? No.

1205. Do you take any interest in politics? Certainly.

1206. Are you a supporter of this Government? Yes, I have always voted Conservative. But I don't think the militia should suffer for the sake of the party though.

HON. MR. BOWELL—That is truly patriotic.

By Dr. Ferguson, Welland:

1207. When did you come to the city of Ottawa? This morning.

1208. Did you report yourself to the secretary of this committee first, or with whom have you been since you came in? Previous to coming here, at a quarter past ten, I was introduced to Mr. Mulock, as I did not know the gentleman before. I walked up here to the building with him.

INSPECTOR WATSON recalled.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

1209. You heard the statement made by Mr. Crean with reference to that tunic, in which he stated that the cloth was English. Will you tell me whether that was English or Canadian—the one to which he referred? This is the one he said was English. It is English, the scarlet.

1210. Is that the one he said was English? Yes, sir; that is the one.

1211. Could you tell me what that scarlet tunic cost the Government? I cannot tell you.

Col. MACPHERSON, recalled.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell:

1212. What did that scarlet tunic cost the Government? Five dollars.

Inspector WATSON.—The last witness (Mr. Crean) said he could tell the Canadian made tunic from his knowledge of the goods without looking at the tab. He has insinuated that the tab has been tampered with. This witness, who, I can very plainly see, is prejudiced in the matter, insinuates that these tabs, by which anyone would recognize the tunics, have been tampered with. In other words, that I have caused Mr. Sanford's tab to be put on an English tunic. I would like to have it definitely settled if that is from his knowledge of the goods, independent of the tabs, whether that is a Canadian-made tunic or an English. He said "if it was a Canadian," but he did not believe it was. What I want to have definitely understood is, without any reference to the mark, whether that is Canadian-made or English. He has pronounced it a better tunic than the other, and I want to know whether it is Canadian or not?

Mr. CREAN recalled.

Mr. CREAN.—I said, as I presumed by the tab, that it was Canadian, but it was good enough to be English; that if the Queen's Own got such tunics as that they would be satisfied.

1213. You said you would be able to tell the Canadian-made cloth from the make of it. He is bound to insinuate that this is an English-made tunic. I can show you 500 such tunics. It is the best I ever seen.

By Dr. Ferguson :

1214. Is that a Canadian-made tunic? If Mr. Watson says so.

1215. You said you knew from your experience. Now tell us? Canadian-made tunics have Mr. Sanford's name on them.

1216. What I wish to say is this: This gentleman said he knew the issue of 1885 was Canadian and made in Canada, because he knew from his experience as a tailor and a woollen man that the cloth was Canadian. If his evidence is good in one case it should be in the other? I should judge that to be a Canadian cloth.

1217. You do not know positively that it is? I would say it is.

1218. Might not the same mistake have arisen with regard to your judgment of the issue of 1885? No, sir; it was of very poor quality. There is a rifle tunic here that I would make no mistake about.

1219. You knew it was Canadian by your experience and your knowledge of cloth and the making? Yes.

1220. Now then you say you cannot tell positively whether this is a Canadian-made tunic, or if Canadian cloth or not? Yes, I say this is Canadian cloth. The other tunic was a very poor cloth, very much inferior to that.

1221. Is that a Canadian-made tunic as well? Well, now that has Mr. W. E. Sanford's company's name on it.

1222. Never mind the tag, is that a Canadian-made tunic? By the make of the tunic—

THE CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell the difference?

By Dr. Ferguson :

1223. If your experience won't tell you, it won't tell you regarding the tunics of 1885? Oh, yes.

1224. Is that Canadian cloth? I presume it is.

1225. Is it Canadian-made? I presume it is.

1226. The only reason why you know this is a Canadian-made tunic—you say in 1885 they were so poorly made that they were Canadian-made tunics? I presume also they had a name there too.

1227. You said a little while ago you didn't know the name? I don't remember the name.

1228. From your knowledge of the cloth and make is that Canadian cloth, and is that a Canadian-made tunic, that is what I want to know? Yes, I would say so.

1229. You say so positively? Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN.—I haven't the slightest doubt, perhaps there may be a tunic made in Canada from English cloth by anyone who knows the cloth and material in the English tunic and you could hardly tell the difference. I hold that is a different thing when you consider the entire stock and examine the whole lot there is no difficulty. It is not fair to put this question in that way.

By Sir Adolphe Caron (addressing Mr. Watson):

1230. Will you state again to the Committee how you came to select a tunic to make a sealed sample of it. Whether you took any particular one or whether you took it out of your stock without reference to any particular one or not? I may say here that the samples that I have got here that are sealed are the English sealed patterns that were originally used when we commenced to make Canadian goods. When this investigation was likely to come up I was requested by the director of stores to supply a set of samples from stock. They were not made specially for the purpose. They were taken from stock in the ordinary way, and I will venture to say if this gentleman wishes to come down with the sub-committee here I can show him 1,000, or 5,000 probably, tunics made as well and of as good cloth as that.

By Mr. Mulock :

1231. When were these made? Probably last year or this year, I don't know which. They are Canadian-made tunics.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—We will be delighted to show the stores to the gentlemen of the Committee.

Color-Sergeant McKELL called and examined.

By Mr. Mulock :

1232. Are you connected with the Queen's Own? Yes.

1233. What is your position? Color Sergeant.

1234. How long have you been in the Queen's Own? Thirteen years.

1235. Have you any prejudice against this Government? I am a red hot Conservative myself and always have been. I have worked against yourself before now.

1236. Be as brief as possible. How long have you been in the Queen's Own? Thirteen years.

1237. Attentive to your work? I have never been once off parade yet. I was on parade last night before I left for here.

1238. Do you take an interest in your work? Yes.

1239. Do you know if any of the Queen's Own have purchased out of their own pockets uniforms lately? Yes, I have purchased them myself.

1240. When? Last year.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—I object to that question being put and I will give the reason why. It matters very little if the Queen's Own crack regiment are anxious to get the best clothing and send to England to get their tunics manufactured in so far as the contract being investigated by the Committee on Public Accounts is concerned. If the gentlemen belonging to the Queen's Own prefer sending to England and prefer also paying out of their own pockets instead of receiving them from the Government stores, I do not see that our time should be taken up by questioning witnesses as to whether these tunics are imported or are going to be imported from England. That has absolutely nothing to do with the enquiry we are proceeding with.

By Mr. Mulock :

1241. Why did the men buy their own uniforms from England instead of what was issued by the department? Owing to the poor quality of the clothing supplied to the regiment by the department.

1242. How do you know it was of poor quality? I know a bad tunic from a good one. I bought a suit in England last summer which I have in my valise and I also have the uniform served out to me by the Militia Department. I do not think it takes an expert to see the difference between the two uniforms. It costs us quite a bit of money to get these tunics altered. I have been the originator of getting these uniforms from England, from being over there last year.

1243. Did you hear what Mr. Crean said about the altering of the uniforms? Yes.

1244. Do you agree with him as far as your knowledge goes about the faults of the tunics? Yes; I represent the opinion of the non-commissioned officers and men who have to pay for these things out of their own pocket.

1245. They are dissatisfied with these uniforms on account of badness. Define badness? In the first place we are a rifle regiment, and a rifle regiment should be dressed in rifle green uniforms. Mr. Crean thinks there are some rifle green uniforms in the regiment, but I do not think there are any. It is a common remark by persons on church parade day when the sun is shining, that there are a dozen different colors in a company. I know about the clothing, as I have charge of the stores. The general impression is that they get a waist that would fit a well known man in Toronto—Ald. Baxter. He is a man who would make four or five of me. Last night before I left, a private turned in a tunic which had all gone to pieces, and he asked my permission before to take a corporal's tunic—the tunic of a corporal who had left the regiment. He brought the tunic down last night, and in taking off the stripes the piece of the cloth came out with it. We cannot get a fit, and we have to

take them to Crean or somewhere else. Lots of them do take them to their own private tailor and it cost a certain amount of money to get them altered.

1246. You send the individual measurements to England? Yes, and get them at a lower price than we could buy them for from the department. We can put that tunic on a man's back to fit him, at less expense than we can get it from the department.

By Mr. Somerville:

1247. Do you get a rebate on clothing coming in? That is the law, I understand. I have got a rebate on my own clothing.

By Mr. Mulock:

1248. How many companies have ordered English tunics? Five, I believe now; but the rest no doubt will order them, except the Government fixes it in such a position that they cannot.

1249. Five companies have done what you say, paying out of their pockets therefor? Yes.

1250. The Minister of Militia suggests that perhaps this action on the part of your regiment is because the Queen's Own is very particular in regard to its appearance? Our men are used to being dressed respectable in civil life, and when they put on uniforms they don't want to be dressed in rags, and they would rather put their hands in their pockets and give a little more to get good uniforms. When I came from the North-West, I was wearing my own clothing through the North-West which I bought out of my own pocket, and which a non-commissioned officer has to do, and when I came back I was served out a pair of blue trowsers which I have in my valise now—blue trowsers for a rifle regiment.

1251. Let us see them?

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—Are we going to examine the trowsers used during the North-West troubles?

THE CHAIRMAN.—We have been proceeding irregularly all through in this investigation.

WITNESS.—These are the trowsers served out to them after the North-West. These were the ones in lieu of the ones I had.

By Mr. Bowell:

1252. It is the color you object to? I object to the color and the cloth, both. That is the tunic I got in the fall of 1887. There is the English tunic I bought in England, and the cloth trowsers for less money than I would get them from the Quarter master.

1253. These cloth trowsers are not green, are they? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock:

1254. How did the recent issue that we are considering, the issue of 1887 and 1888 compare with the militia issue when you were commencing—how long have you been in the service? Thirteen years.

1255. You were in in 1876? Yes.

1256. How did the issue of recent years, of 1887 and 1888, compare with the issues of ten years ago? The general impression throughout the regiment is that the issues are getting worse.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

1257. Getting worse? Yes. That is the impression of the men generally. I am speaking now as a non-commissioned officer, and I hold the same opinions as the great majority of the regiment do at the present time.

By Mr. Hesson:

1258. Is that as to workmanship or material? As regards the cloth and fit. We cannot get a fit without taking the clothes to Crean or someone else. I paid \$9 to get this tunic fixed here with stripes and one thing or another on it.

1259. Why didn't you get a new one? I got that one and the trowsers for \$9 in England.

By Sir Adolphe Caron:

1260. You could have got a new one for \$5? Yes, a new one, but the Government does not supply us with colors, stripes or cord or anything else.

By Mr. Mulock :

1261. That is the pattern of the English goods issued? Well, before we sent for these goods we got samples from the different firms in England, some of them a great deal lower in price than that tunic there. We can get a great deal cheaper tunics in England. Of course I don't speak from any index you may have here, I am speaking of what is served out to the Queen's Own regiment in Toronto. The Government may have just as fine tunics here, and just as good as English tunics, but we don't see them in Toronto.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1262. Are all the men purchasing clothing as good as yours? Yes, that is the sample.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1263. Have you any authority from your commanding officers to bring down these tunics? No, sir, these are bought with my own money. It is my own private property.

1264. But those that were issued to you by the Government? Yes, sir.

1265. Who permitted you to bring them. Did you take them as Quartermaster out of the store? They were given to me.

1266. Who gave them? The quarter master.

1267. Had you any authority from your commanding officer to go and get them? I made application in the North-West, and could not get anything.

1268. You have stated that you had in your valise the trowsers which you have produced to-day and which you have shown, which you state had been issued to you after your return from the North-West? Yes.

1269. Where did you get those trowsers to bring them down to Ottawa? I got them in my own house.

1270. You do not keep them then in the regimental stores? No, we do not do that. We cannot walk down the street without uniforms and we have no drill shed wherein to dress ourselves.

1271. You speak only of your own uniform. I understood you got these out of the quartermaster's stores? Yes, certainly, when they were issued.

1272. If I understood you correctly you said the cloth and make from 1885 had been getting worse and worse every year? That is the impression of the non-commissioned officers and men in the regiment.

1273. How did you come to make this contract for clothing in England. Were you sent over? No; I was going over on a visit, and after I had paid so much money for getting these uniforms fixed, and yet they looked so shabby, I thought I would try and get something better and some value for my money. When I was in England I got this uniform made, and when I brought it out everybody was so pleased, they wanted the same thing.

1274. You have arranged about getting out these English uniforms since? That is for my own company, with the permission of the commanding officer.

By Mr. Mulock :

1275. Who was the commanding officer? At that time Lieut.-Col. Allan. It is not the officers that pay for these uniforms; we pay for them ourselves.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1276. You have a certain pride, and would rather be dressed in better uniforms than the Government supply? We are not anxious to spend any more money. I have given a great deal of time and money already. I have been a long time in the regiment and I am proud of being in it.

1277. You are proud of looking neat, and want a better coat than others? No; I want to see every man dressed alike.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1278. It would be rather expensive? If I go to the quartermaster and get a suit that costs me \$9.50, and I pay two or three dollars beside, for the trowsers have to be altered as well as tunics, and I pay \$3 at least and may be \$4 to get it altered,

which will make it \$13.50, whereas I have the English with tunics guaranteed to fit for \$9.50.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—We get them altered in our batteries for 50 cents.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1279. Have you examined these different coats, the scarlet tunic and the green one? I don't know anything about the scarlet at all. I never had anything to do with that.

1280. I was asking you if you examined the two that Mr. Crean examined? I am speaking here about what is actually served to us, not what you have down here.

By Mr. Taylor :

1281. Those served you were the clothing that went out of the stores in 1885, were they? I would not say so. I would not think that tunic went to the stores in 1885. I know we are always there. It is hard to get anything. As soon as it comes there it is just gobbled up at once. I received my tunic in the fall of 1886.

1282. Was it Canadian or English make? I suppose it was Canadian made.

1283. Was it branded so? The quartermaster when I went to get it said they were Canadian.

1284. Was there any brand of the maker on it? I could not say, I did not examine it that closely.

1285. Did they have the tag with the makers name on them when they were issued? No, I don't think so.

1286. You can't identify yours as being made by a Canadian maker. I could have identified it when it was served to me.

1287. Did it have a tag on it, then? I don't know, it might have had two tags on it for all I know.

1288. Has it a stamped tag on it now, has it? No, it has nothing except a little more ornaments on the arms.

1289. Was there anything to identify it as being a Canadian made tunic until what your quartermaster told you? I suppose the poor quality.

1290. Look at that (tunic produced). See if there is any brand on it to show if it was made in Canada or in England? There is nothing on the tag that I can see; of course it is pretty well rubbed.

By Mr. Taylor (addressing Mr. Watson) :

1291. Has that been made by Sanford, O'Brien, Shorey or Doull, of Halifax, the present contractors to the present Government? It has not been made by any of them.

1292. These four men are the present contractors and have been since 1885? Yes.

1293. That is not one of their contract? It is not one of their contract.

WITNESS.—It is what the Government distributed to us.

COL. O'BRIEN, M.P., called and examined.

By Mr. Bowell :

1294. How long have you been in the Militia? Since the Trent affair.

1295. You have had constant communication with the clothing department since that time? Yes.

1296. Would you give us your opinion generally as to the quality of the clothing that you formerly received of English-make, and this you are now receiving from the stores of Canadian-make? Well, you must consider the difference in the position of a regiment like mine and that of the Queen's Own, for instance. The wear and tear of our clothing is not a test of the actual wearing power of the cloth, for this reason, that the Government with their ill-judged economy, I think, only issue us one suit, a tunic and a pair of trowsers to each man in camp. Whenever

they are in camp they are wearing these two articles. What else would they wear? Of course, they could go in their shirt sleeves, but they are obliged to wear this tunic and trowsers, whether it is on guard, cooking, sleeping or anything else, so that the clothing becomes soiled and unfit to wear long before the cloth, in the ordinary sense of the term, is worn out, so I cannot say from any experience I have had as to the actual wearing quality of the cloth, because, as I say, it generally becomes unfit for wear from the hard usage to which it is exposed, which makes it dirty without its having become worn out.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1297. That would apply to the English cloth? To all cloth of any description. The only really bad clothing I know of was the issue of the lightish blue serge some years ago. That was worthless cloth.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—You are quite right.

By Mr. Mulock :

1298. How are your men uniformed? Scarlet. I know nothing about rifle clothing at all. The last issue of clothing we had I was told was Canadian, but the fact is, I have a great many other things beside clothing to think of in my regiment and I do not pay as much attention to it as the Queen's Own do. Speaking generally, however, I have not found with regard to the fit of the clothing those difficulties that have been spoken of here. I have not found as a general thing that the trowsers were three inches too long or that the tunics were three inches too large around the waist, or that there has been any such misfit as has been spoken of here.

By Mr. Bowell :

1299. You have not noticed it? No. Most of the men we get in the force, whether it applies to country regiments specially or not I do not know, are half-grown lads. You take a tunic that is fit for a man of 5 feet 10 and put it on one of these half-grown lads, who ought to be 4 or 5 inches around the chest bigger than he is, and you will not find it fit. If he were in the regiment for 4 or 5 years and straightened up as in the English service, that tunic would fit him, but when he is bent down in the chest and not properly set up, we cannot make it fit him nor the tailors cannot. The trouble is with the man. You get this man properly set up to look like an English soldier and he will fit his tunic, but he is only half grown and the consequence is that the tunics are frequently too large around the chest. I confess I like my men to look as well as they can and I have not found any such trouble with them as has been here spoken of. I am merely saying I have not found that trouble with the fit of the clothing that I have heard spoken of here.

HON. MR. BOWELL—Your experience is precisely my own with respect to country regiments.

LT.-COL. TYRWHITT, M. P., called and examined,

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1300. You have heard the evidence which has been taken here this morning and the complaints made against the clothing? My evidence would be very much the same as Col. O'Brien's, as it is many years since it was my duty to go into this sort of thing particularly. I think the color-sergeant or captain, it is more his province to deal with the fit of uniforms; but speaking generally, I took the trouble last year—or every year until this year—to visit the stores with a view to looking at the clothing partly for my own amusement and satisfaction and partly to kill time. I was very much struck last year with the improvement in the make of the clothing. Of course, I do not profess to be a very great judge, but in talking the matter over, what struck me most, for instance in the trowsers, was the improvement in the way the buttons were sewn on. In the old issues, during the first few days that the trowsers were worn the buttons all came off, but now I think it would be utterly impossible for the buttons to come off without a portion of the cloth coming too. Also

in the fork of the trowsers, I think that is very much improved, for the reason that the lining is better sewn and more neatly stitched. Formerly it appeared to me to be put in there as lightly as possible, in fact it was simply basted in so that it came out after being a time or two worn. Speaking of what I saw in the stores and without having any bias whatever, I think that the present make is very much superior to those of the old or those that we received years ago.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1301. There is a great improvement? A great improvement, and as to the color of the cloth now. I have attended this Committee almost every day, and I have heard a great many witnesses accounting for the discoloration of the cloth. I account for it by perspiration. We know that the tunics are usually ruined from the heat inside, and not from the sun, and I can corroborate what Col. O'Brien says regarding these tunics. I have never seen one worn out. I have occasionally seen them burst, owing to the perspiration and their being put away when damp, and when it is pulled out the following season it has rotted, and when a big man tries to get into a tunic two or three sizes too small, the chances are he will burst it. Most of the scarlet tunics are spoiled partly from the black from the rifle after the firing, and then add to that these knapsacks issued covered with varnish, which will varnish a man's back, so that the uniform is almost unserviceable. It is unfit to be seen long before it is worn out.

By Mr. Mulock :

1302. You know nothing about the rifle green? No.

1303. You have had no experience? Not in the rifles.

LT.-COL. PRIOR, M.P., called and examined.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1304. Will you give us your opinion about the clothing, what you know of it. You have been in the force for some time? Well, we have had the issue in 1887 and 1888. Some of it was issued in 1887 and some in 1888, and I know there is a great difference from what there used to be. It is far better now than it used to be. The only thing I have to say is something on the same line as stated by Col. O'Brien and Col. Tyrwhitt. We never see the cloth wear out. It is worse with us even. We are a garrison artillery, and there is a great deal of hard work, and the uniform they wear the whole time. They wear it at gun drills, and it is extremely hard work on the tunics. The right thing would be for the Government to supply us with a working suit.

1305. As compared with the old issue, what is your opinion about the fits? Well, I don't see how anybody could say anything about the fits, about the fits of the uniforms?

1306. Yes? The captain sends the men to the tailor with them, and they pay \$2 a man to get the uniform fitted.

1307. They always do it? Every one of them get them as near a fit as they possibly can. There is the greatest difference in the trowsers. The English trowsers we used to have given us were miserable things, but the present ones we get now are very good. I know some of the officers wear them themselves on parade at drill.

1308. These are Canadian trowsers? Yes, I presume it is Canadian. I don't know. It is the last issue that we had in 1887 and 1888.

LT. COL. CARPENTER, M.P., called and examined:

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1309. Will you tell us what you know about the clothing? We have had but little experience with the Canadian make. Our first issue of Canadian make was in

1888, just previous to our annual drill last year. We were not able to speak as to the wearing quality, but only as to the fit and satisfaction was given to the men. I may say that the men are remarkably well satisfied with the issue they got last year. It was the universal expression on the part of the men that it had given them less trouble and difficulty in fitting than ever before. We have had no experience as far as the wearing quality is concerned, but the men are all satisfied with the fit.

Mr. MULOCK.—I remind the chairman that I was cut short on that.

Mr. MONCRIEFF.—The question you were cut short on was the general effect the clothing had on the regiment.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—I did not put the question to the witness as to the feeling in the regiment.

COL. CARPENTER.—I may say that we have always experienced difficulty with discoloration under the arms in the scarlet.

By Mr. Mulock :

1310. How are your men uniformed? Scarlet.

1311. Your regiment is the 77th? Yes.

1312. You have had no experience with rifle green? No.

HON. MR. MACINNES called and examined.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1313. I wish to produce this letter signed by Mr. McInnes and have him acknowledge his handwriting. Is that your handwriting? Yes.

1314. Do you remember me having a conversation with you about clothing for the militia force of Canada?

MR. MULOCK.—How can that be evidence?

1314½. You will see it in a different way. Will you state to the Committee if you have expressed any opinion as to the mode that should be adopted to procure the best clothing for the militia force of Canada?

MR. MULOCK.—Will that be evidence to give an opinion to the Committee now?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—I would like the honorable gentleman to remember how often he has elicited expressions of opinion from the witnesses of this morning. He was continually asking the witness to express his opinion about so and so.

MR. MULOCK.—I have no objections to his giving any opinions to the Committee.

1315. Will you kindly state whether the opinion you express in this letter is the opinion you hold about the manufacture of clothing for the Canadian force? Shall I read the letter?

1316. Yes? It is addressed to Sir Adolphe by myself and is dated the 31st of March, of this year: "You have no doubt forgotten about your consulting me as to the best mode of getting your supplies of clothing from Canadian makers for the militia. I recommended you to ask leading firms to tender in place of advertising in the newspapers, and I gave you the names of some firms upon whom you could rely. That is, they would be able to carry out their contracts, whereas by advertising, small and irresponsible firms would apply and tender at lower prices than could be legitimately done, hoping to make up for the loss by making claims for extras, &c. If my evidence can be of any use to you in arriving at the truth you have only to send for me."

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1317. Well, you saw some advantage in having the clothing manufactured by the large firms whose names you have given there? Yes. I believe that the public interest would be better served if the department would apply to these leading firms to tender for the clothing which was required. I gave you the names I think of Doull & Miller, of Halifax, Shorey & Co., of Montreal, O'Brien & Co., of Montreal, and W. E. Sanford & Co., of Hamilton. I think these were the names which I gave

you at that time, and I can state to the Committee that I had no personal interest in the matter to serve in any shape or form in giving that opinion.

1318. You are engaged in manufacturing? I am not manufacturing these goods.

1319. Are these gentlemen customers of yours any of them? Oh they are.

The quantity of cotton used for the militia is exceedingly small.

1320. They are customers of yours for cotton. Sanford & Co., are customers? Yes.

1321. O'Brien & Co.? I am not sure whether they were customers or not.

1322. And the other firms? They are, yes.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—The leading firms are trying to get the best material they possibly can, Senator McInnes.

Lieut.-Colonel MACPHERSON, recalled and further examined.

By Sir Adolphe Caron :

1323. As superintendent of stores I think you have been charged with the opening of the tenders, you and other officers? I form one of the board of officers.

1324. Will you state to the Committee if within your experience during the last several years any other firm has ever tendered except the firms the names of which have just been mentioned to your recollection? In 1886, the last year we advertised for clothing, although we advertised that year by the newspapers, in 1886, under the head of clothing those four firms tendered and also another firm, John Martin & Co., of Montreal; but they merely tendered for the supply of band wings and forage caps.

1325. That was in 1886? Band wings and forage caps were the only two things they tendered for, but for general clothing there were only these four firms.

1326. Who have tendered since 1886? Yes.

By Mr. Mulock :

1327. Speaking of forage caps, did you have some forage caps returned to store as unfit? Yes, we had a few.

1328. From where? We had some forage caps returned to store of Kilmarnock shape. They were returned from several corps. They got into the practice of wearing Glengarry forage caps of a different shape altogether, and many of the corps who took the Kilmarnocks were dissatisfied and preferred to return them to store and get an allowance equal to the cost of the forage caps they would purchase for themselves.

1329. Did you have any returned simply because they would not fit? There might have been a few artillery forage caps.

1330. From what batteries? Possibly some from "A" and "B" Batteries.

1331. These are regulars? Yes.

1332. Do you know anything about the Welland Battery? I am not clear about it, I would not say positively about the Welland Battery.

1333. Do you know whether or not they returned their caps because they would not fit? I am not aware. I am not prepared to answer that question without referring to the correspondence. I cannot recollect now on the moment, at the present moment, with reference to the Welland Battery.

1334. I understand you will find it is the case? Very likely it may be. I could not charge my mind with anything just at the moment.

1335. You have had some things returned from "C" Battery within the last few weeks? We had a few pairs of trowsers, I think, yes.

1336. You got a communication from Col. Holmes on that subject, did you? I didn't get any communication.

1337. You mentioned it to the Chairman, I think? He didn't get it.

By Hon. Mr. Bowell :

1338. Are these complaints anything new. Are they of a late date or have they existed since you have been there? We have always had complaints, more or less, a few complaints.

1339. The return of a few coats, or a few caps, or a whole lot would be nothing anyway? They would be misfits and we would exchange them.

1340. I ask him if this hadn't been the practice since he had been there and before also? Yes; in my experience there has always been more or less every year of a return of certain articles. They don't fit very well, perhaps, and they make exchanges of them, forage caps and clothing.

1341. Did the corps to which you belonged in Montreal, before you became an employee of the Government in the service—were they always contented, the corps to which you belonged? As a general rule, I think, they were.

Colonel POWELL, re-called.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—I should like to ask the honorable gentlemen, before the witness is put under examination, what the question is, because the witness has already been examined, and unless it is some matter quite new, or that has reference to portions of the evidence which have been taken to-day and given by the other witnesses, I do not see that he should be examined.

Mr. MULOCK.—I do not think you could suppose I had anything to do with this witness. In the communication dated 16th September, 1887, to the Adjutant General of Canada, from Webb & Co. (See Exhibit "C.") C. J. Webb & Co.

1342. There is here a tender to supply certain goods, and I would like the witness to take the contract (Exhibit "A 42") he has in his hands, and tell me what the goods cost according to that tender.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—The witness, when he was first examined, stated that the communication from Webb & Co., London military tailors, was not a tender.

Mr. MULOCK.—Whatever it was.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—Now, the object of the question which the honorable gentleman is putting is to show that the tenders we had from England—

Mr. MULOCK.—You need not call it a tender.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—I call it a tender because the honorable gentleman called it a tender. I say the nature of that communication was stated by the witness when first under examination here, and that it was merely a communication sent by Webb & Co. for the information of the department, as to what the English prices were at that period of time, and so that we might be able to have some idea of the value of the clothing to be called for in Canada. Now, that question has been gone into and investigated. Every possible facility has been given to the honorable gentleman to examine and cross-examine this witness upon that tender, which is a private communication that should never have been brought here; but I was desirous that every document that we had should be laid before the Committee so as to prove beyond the possibility of discussion that the officials in the Department of Militia had done their duty. This document should not be subject again to examination by the witness, as it was not a tender but a letter written for the information of the department and which he laid before me. I think the witness should not now be examined, but that this investigation should close.

By Mr. Mulock:

1342. I just want to ask the witness here to explain some terms here. Would you tell me according to the document in your hand, what the contract price is by that document for serge trowsers?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—There are the documents here and they speak for themselves.

Mr. MULOCK.—They don't speak for themselves. I want to know if there is anything in that contract?

WITNESS.—There are no infantry serge trowsers in that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.—Mr. Chairman, what is your ruling?

THE CHAIRMAN.—I cannot see any objection now to having the evidence, it is far better to have it all. We have it so far. I don't think we have the right to open up the same thing again and again.

MR. MULOCK.—I was cut off short in the middle of an examination. Col. Powell, will you tell me then is there anything in that contract for the supply of artillery serge trowsers? No.

1344. Infantry serge jackets? No.

1345. For infantry scarlet cloth tunic, No. 2 pattern? Yes.

1346. What is the price mentioned there for the infantry scarlet cloth tunic, No. 2 pattern?

THE CHAIRMAN.—What object have you got in going into that now?

MR. MULOCK.—You find an item there of infantry scarlet cloth tunic, No. 2 pattern? Yes.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—The contracts have been filed and they are now before the Committee, and it seems to me that this is taking up time.

MR. MULOCK.—You are very much afraid of these contracts.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON.—I am not at all afraid of the contracts or the honorable gentleman.

MR. HESSON.—It is a question of time and we have been trifled with long enough.

MR. MULOCK.—It is not a question of time at all. That has to do with infantry scarlet cloth tunics, No. 2 pattern. What is the price fixed in that contract? Five dollars for each one of the scarlet cloth tunics.

1347. The scarlet cloth tunics, price \$5? Yes.

1348. Infantry scarlet cloth tunics an ounce heavier than the other, have you got that there? No. The tunics that were made were intended to be of the No. 2 pattern.

1349. No. 2 pattern? Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.—What is the object of going into that kind of thing when it is here before us?

MR. MULOCK.—The different words used.

By Mr. Bowell.

1350. Is that the tunic we have had referred to here? Yes.

1351. That is the tunic Mr. Crean stated would cost \$10.75? This is Mr. Sanford's tender and there are no serges in it at all.

By Mr. Mulock:

1352. What is the price for a rifle cloth tunic?

DR. FERGUSON.—As this contract is in evidence everyone can examine it himself.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I don't see the object of Mr. Mulock's inquiry there at all.

MR. MULOCK.—I have an intelligent object in view.

MR. HESSON.—Mr. Mulock has established one thing. It cost \$10.75 to get up such a suit for the volunteers of Toronto. It cost about \$5 to get them from the Canadian make. You have also established the fact that the Canadian tunic as presented here to-day is a superior tunic.

DR. FERGUSON.—The meaning of that contract I claim must be interpreted by the Committee and not by witness there in a few moments' time. I object to an interpretation being put upon that contract by one witness. No witness has the right to put an interpretation upon it.

MR. MULOCK.—I am only asking him to point out to me a portion of the contract. The enquiry was then closed.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization respectfully submit their first and final report.

Your committee examined Mr. John Lowe, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, on the subject of immigration.

He made a statement respecting the results of the year, from which it appears that the total number of immigrants who settled in Canada during the year 1888 was 88,766, as against 84,526 in 1887.

The character of the year's immigration was reported to be satisfactory, it being alleged that no paupers were shown to have arrived who were in any way a burden on any charity; and further, that none of the immigrants who came to seek work remained over at any of the departmental agencies unemployed.

It was stated that the High Commissioner in England, Sir Charles Tupper, has an understanding with the Local Government Boards, in virtue of which no paupers are allowed to embark for Canada without his consent, which is not granted unless it is shown they have friends to take care of them.

As regards the immigration of children under the auspices of benevolent persons or societies, it was ordered, in accordance with the suggestions of the committee last Session, that there should be a medical inspection of each child before embarking; and it is reported that the practice has been carried out with satisfactory results.

The number of settlers who were reported to have gone into the North-West during the year 1888 was 29,685, as against 21,685 in the previous year. The figures include immigrants from other countries and migrants from the older Provinces.

So far as ascertained and reported by the immigration agents, the sum of \$3,774,455 in money and effects was brought in by settlers.

The system of assisted passages, which had been in operation since 1872, ceased altogether on the 27th April, 1888.

The total expenditure during the calendar year for immigration purposes was \$183,057, to which must be added \$43,444 on account of assisted passages, the liability for which had been incurred before the commencement of the year, as against \$313,891 for 1887, thus showing a very decided reduction in the cost of the service.

The total expenditure of the Department in Canada for immigration publications during the calendar year 1888 was \$23,534, a fact showing retrenchment in this branch of the service as compared with previous years.

Mr. Lowe also gave the committee some valuable statistics respecting the movements of populations in Canada and the United States in relation to the subject of immigration, having special reference to the agricultural classes. The facts stated by him, as reported, are contained in the appendix herewith.

Mr. W. A. Webster was examined in relation to the efforts made by agents of American railway companies to induce Canadians in Ontario and the older Provinces to emigrate to the north-western States.

He stated that he had travelled over a considerable portion of the States of Dakota and Minnesota, with a view of ascertaining, by personal observation, whether those States possessed any advantages over our own North-West for immigrant

settlement. He also visited Manitoba and the Canadian North-West. The result of the observations and the conclusions arrived at are that the advantages of our North-West over that portion of the north-western States consists in the fact of possession of better soil, a milder climate and more equitable homesteading land laws, together with greater immunity from early frosts and violent storms.

Mr. Webster visited many of the counties in Ontario, with a view of pointing out the advantages he described to the young men of that Province, and he expresses the opinion that the information thus conveyed had induced many to migrate to Manitoba and the North-West Territories who would otherwise have gone to the United States.

Mr. J. T. Carey appeared before the committee to make objections, on behalf of the Knights of Labor, to the payment of a bonus as an assistance to child immigration. He spoke in special reference to the competition of these children in the Canadian labor market. His remarks, as reported, are contained in the appendix herewith.

Professor Saunders, Director of Government Experimental Farms, was examined by the committee, and he stated that the results of numerous experiments had shown that the wheat called "Ladoga" ripens fully ten days earlier than "Red Fife." There appears, however, to have been considerable difference in the opinion expressed by the different bodies of experts to which the wheat was submitted as to its quality. The same samples have been graded variously as "hard wheat," "soft wheat" and "No. 1 hard."

Mr. Saunders, having stated that a series of careful experiments had been made by the chemist of the Central Experimental Farm, which demonstrated that the Ladoga was superior in gluten to the Red Fife, while reports from bakers and specimens of bread shown proved that the flour produced from it was strong in bread-making qualities, even more so than that from the Red Fife, the color of the bread, however, being a shade less white.

The remarks made by Mr. Saunders on the subject of the barley product of the Dominion, and the importance for Canadian farmers of growing varieties suitable for malting purposes in England, cannot be too carefully considered by them. He showed that we were in danger, from two causes, of a lessened demand for our four and six-rowed varieties in the United States market, which had hitherto taken such large quantities; and, on the other hand, that the importation into England, for malting purposes, reached the quantity of 35,000,000 bushels a year, and for which much higher prices are paid than our farmers have hitherto obtained. It has, therefore, become a matter of prime importance for Canadian farmers to produce varieties to suit the English market. The kind used in England is the two-rowed, the four and six-rowed being not at all saleable there for malting purposes. Mr. Saunders stated that a large number of samples of the very best varieties of the two-rowed had been distributed among farmers in different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. Saunders stated that 913 seed germinating tests had been made during the year, of which 216 were of frozen wheat, 20 of frozen oats and 19 of frozen barley.

These tests showed that the vitality of frozen wheat varied from 21 to 99 per cent., frozen barley 14 to 99 per cent., and frozen oats from 2 to 94 per cent. The

conclusion arrived at was that it was most unwise for farmers to sow anything but good seed, unless driven to it by absolute necessity, the rule being the same in vegetable as in animal life, from which it followed that a good constitution of seed was necessary in plant life to produce a good result.

Much of the information presented to the committee on these subjects is contained in a bulletin published in March last; and the evidence of Mr. Saunders, as reported, is contained in an appendix herewith.

The Dairymen's Association of the Dominion, which held its meeting at Ottawa on the 9th and 10th of April, appointed a delegation to present its views before the committee; and the statements made by the delegates are submitted herewith as part of this report.

The importance of the dairying interest to the Dominion is evidenced by the fact that our exports of cheese grew from \$13,675, in 1860, to \$8,928,242, in 1888; and the excellence of Canadian cheese is made manifest by the further fact that whilst the Dominion exported, during the last year, 4,000,000 lbs. less weight than the United States, the actual money value of the Canadian export exceeded that of the United States by nearly \$200,000.

The representations in relation to butter making which were made by the delegates are worthy of the attention of farmers. Their main object was to cause such steps to be taken as would increase the product and improve the quality of Canadian butter.

The resolution passed by the committee, after the hearing of the delegates, in approval of their recommendations, is appended herewith as a portion of this report.

The elaborate report of the sub-committee, of which General Laurie was the chairman, on the subject of tuberculosis in animals, in relation to its effects on mankind, as a question of public health, is hereto appended. The sub-committee was requested, during the last Session of Parliament, to continue its enquiries during the recess. This has been done with great carefulness and elaborateness, and for which the thanks of the committee were expressed by resolution.

The whole respectfully submitted.

P. WHITE,

Chairman of the Committee.

COMMITTEE ROOM, HOUSE OF COMMONS,
27th April, 1889.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

ON

TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE AND ITS COMMUNICABILITY TO MAN

COMMITTEE ROOM 49,

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 17th April, 1889.

To the Chairman of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization :

The sub-committee appointed for the purpose of considering the question of certain contagious diseases in cattle, and their communicability between man and animals, having more especial reference to tuberculosis, beg to report as follows:—

This sub-committee was originally appointed during the Session of 1888, and held a number of meetings for the purpose of considering how best to proceed; and it was decided that information on this subject should be sought from medical practitioners throughout the Dominion, and from veterinary surgeons, as well as from farmers. For this purpose three sets of questions were prepared, bearing more particularly upon the subject of tuberculosis, and were issued during the recess. Copies of the questions are hereto attached, and marked A, B, C, respectively.

By permission of the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture, these circulars and forms of questions were printed and inclosed with envelopes addressed to the Department of Agriculture, so as to facilitate return. One thousand four hundred and eighty (1,480) were sent out to medical gentlemen engaged in active practice, to which 215 replies were received. Two hundred and twenty-eight (228) were sent out to veterinary surgeons, and forty-two (42) replies were received. Two hundred and eighty-four (284) were sent to farmers, and 134 replies received.

At the commencement of the present Session the sub-committee, having been formally re-appointed, proceeded to examine and analyze the material that had been gathered during the recess, as scheduled.

1. From inquiries addressed to the Royal Agricultural Society of England it was found that a departmental committee, under the authority of the Privy Council of Great Britain, was sitting in 1888 to investigate the nature and extent of pleuro-pneumonia and tuberculosis. It was therefore deemed advisable to obtain the information so collected and the opinions arrived at. An application was accordingly made to the Privy Council, and a Blue Book, containing some 4,000 questions and answers, was received, together with the report of the committee, the latter being the deliberately formed opinions of some of the most capable men and highest authorities in the United Kingdom upon certain matters of very great value, and the sub-committee has considered it advisable to embody in this report, in an appendix, marked D, the full majority report, as well as the minority report of Professor Horsley, on the subject of tuberculosis.

2. Learning also that a searching investigation had been held in the State of Maine, in consequence of an outbreak at the State College Farm at Orono, a communication was addressed to the Principal, Professor Ballantine; and the Hon. H. C. Burleigh, of the Maine House of Representatives, with prompt courtesy sent a copy of the report of the Joint Special Committee, with full evidence of a number of leading experts, including Dr. Bailey and Professor Michener, which is mainly devoted to proving that the disease is both hereditary and contagious, and that the safe course is to destroy animals so affected. The report of this commission, with a short summary of the evidence specially referred to, is embodied in appendix E.

3. An application was also made and promptly replied to with extreme courtesy by Professor Goodill, Director of the Hatch Experimental Station of the Massachusetts Agricultural College, for a copy of the bulletin on tuberculosis prepared by Professor Fernald. This is one of the most complete examinations of this subject in a condensed form, and so valuable is the information it imparts that a renewed application has been made to Professor Goodill, and it is hoped a copy of this bulletin may be obtained for every senator and member of the House of Commons. Some-what lengthy extracts, referring to points of special importance, have been embodied in this report, as Appendix F.

4. The whole of the answers received in reply to circulars have been summarized and entered on schedules, whilst the actual answers are indexed and filed, so as to make the full report readily accessible.

From careful analysis of the reports of the medical practitioners it is ascertained that:—

They believe that from 10 to 50 per cent. of cases of disease and premature death might be prevented by judicious sanitary measures; that consumption is contagious and infectious, and isolation would assist in prevention, but that the chief preventable causes of disease are contagion, impure air and water, unhealthy diet, decaying animal and vegetable matter, bad drainage, general want of cleanliness and sudden changes of temperature, and the ordinary measures are suggested as palliatives; and some report glanders as having been communicated from horses to men; others mention skin diseases, and a few express the opinion that tuberculosis may be transmitted to the human system, as well as diphtheria, by the medium of impure milk and meat; but few have met with actual cases in their own experience of diseases being so communicated. They consider tuberculosis in domestic animals is produced by improper feeding and unhealthy surroundings.

The farmers reply that in the main they have very little knowledge of contagious disease existing, although they mention a few cases of black leg, anthrax, Pictou cattle disease, pneumonia and consumption, in most of which the symptoms appear to be, emaciation and weakness; and they consider these proceed from want of care in stabling, neglect of cleanliness, want of pure air, and either from too poor or too rich food, as well as, probably, hereditary. They express belief that cattle of improved breeds being esteemed more valuable are more confined, and consequently more delicate. There is next to no experience mentioned as to the use of diseased meat or milk; in fact, there is hardly a single reply to the inquiry whether the milk or flesh of animals, whose lungs or liver have been found affected, have been known to be used for food with bad results. This suggests that but few know or observe whether these organs are diseased.

The veterinary surgeons, generally, report that in their practice they have seen occasional cases of tuberculosis and describe the symptoms—as debility, emaciation, etc., and ascribe the development to bad ventilation in stables and unsuitable food, whilst they very generally assert that tuberculosis is hereditary. They consider also that the highest bred cattle are more susceptible and less hardy. A few consider that the meat and milk of diseased animals should not be used.

CONCLUSIONS.

The sub-committee, from the foregoing evidence enumerated, are decidedly of opinion that the disease known as tuberculosis exists to a much greater extent than has been generally recognised.

In the United Kingdom and in Europe preventative legislation has been most strongly urged. The very reference of the inquiry into these diseases to a departmental committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain shows how serious the danger is considered and the necessity for steps to arrest its increase, although it is deemed almost impracticable to attempt to eradicate it, and legislation pointing to the isolation and destruction of herds, with compensation to the owners, is advised and contemplated.

In the State of Maine this action was actually taken in the case of the herd of cattle owned by the State, at the State College Farm at Orono, and every effort has been used to have the cattle, especially bulls, that were sold from this herd in past years, and all their progeny, destroyed. Mr. Burleigh's Bill for further prompt action is another evidence of the danger to which it is considered both the cattle and the population are exposed by permitting tuberculosis to go unchecked.

In Massachusetts public attention has been directed towards this serious state of affairs by the directors of the State Agricultural College; and Professor Fernald's paper, in a most exhaustive examination, warns the community that the disease is

intercommunicable between men and animals—contagious as well as hereditary—and is conveyed by using for food the milk or meat of diseased animals, and that in cases mentioned he found in public markets more than half the carcasses showed signs of disease.

We, in Canada, have reason to congratulate ourselves that our cattle are much more healthy; or, even on the assumption (which is to a certain extent justifiable), that our farmers and medical practitioners have not had their attention specially drawn to this trouble, we can undoubtedly believe that this insidious and fatal disease is not so prevalent with us as in the mother country, or as in the Republic to the south of us. But we also learn that the extreme gravity of the situation is even now only partially realized in those countries, although the evidence shows the great hold it has obtained and the danger to life, health and property that is threatened. We are, therefore, of opinion that it is desirable to circulate the information we have gathered as fully and broadly as possible, both among the medical as well as the agricultural profession, in order to urge the closest scientific investigation, and so that further knowledge may be acquired as to the cause and symptoms of the disease, the methods of meeting it, and the danger that will follow its continued existence among our cattle; and that the information be invited to be available for the consideration of the general committee next Session, in order that such special legislation as may be considered expedient be asked for to check the further progress of this malign disease, and, if possible, to eradicate it.

Realizing also the hereditary nature of tuberculosis, we would strongly recommend, further, that inspectors of cattle at the different quarantine stations be specially cautioned to closely examine imported cattle for any latent indications of this disease, and to refuse admission to any that appear affected.

We are led further to the belief that our enquiries into the subject entrusted to us would have been much facilitated, and productive of a much greater amount of information, if a system of observing and recording vital statistics were established in the Dominion, and thus preventative and precautionary measures against contagion in any form would be better appreciated and more satisfactorily carried out.

Respectfully submitted,

J. WIMBURN LAURIE, *Chairman*,
J. H. WILSON, M.D.,
J. E. ROBERTSON, M.D., C.M.,
H. CAMERON, M.D.,
J. B. R. Fiset, M.D.,
JOHN FERGUSON, M.D.,
W. F. ROOME, M.D.,
P. McDONALD, M.D.

“A.”—TO MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.

CIRCULAR.

COMMITTEE ROOM, HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sanitation.

Form No. 1.

1. In your experience, what proportion of cases of disease and premature deaths might probably be prevented by judicious, public and individual sanitary measures?
2. In your judgment, what proportion of cases of consumption which you have had in your practice might have been prevented?
3. What are the chief preventable causes of disease in your locality, and what preventative measures would you suggest?
4. Do you know of any cases of disease having been communicated from animal to man, and if so, give briefly the particulars?
5. Have any cases of consumption or other tuberculous disease, in adults or children, in your practice or to your knowledge, been caused apparently or clearly by the use of meat or milk from tuberculous cattle, and if so, what number, and what, in brief, were the circumstances?
6. What, in your opinion, is the cause and origin of tuberculosis in domestic animals?

“B.”—TO FARMERS.

CIRCULAR.

COMMITTEE ROOM, HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sanitation.

Form No. 2.

1. Have any cattle died in your district of what you believe to be contagious disease or consumption, and the probable number?
2. Describe the symptoms as they appeared to you?
3. Can you, from personal knowledge, state any instance where disease has been communicated from one animal to another, and can you, from experience, say whether the method under which cattle are cared for, housed and fed, exercises any influence in producing or bringing on disease?
4. Have you observed whether any, and if so, what diseases in parents are reproduced in the progeny?
5. Have you any reason to believe that any special food has a tendency to produce disease? If so, how food and disease produced?
6. Have you reason to believe that certain breeds of cattle are more liable than others to disease? Will you give instances from personal knowledge?
7. In cases where animals have shown diseased lungs or liver, has the milk or flesh been used for human food, and if so, has any injury to consumers of such milk or flesh resulted therefrom?

(N.B.—Under the head “Remarks,” place such observations as you may think of general interest and pertinent to the subject, and such as are not implied in the questions or answers. These remarks to be confined to your own professional practice and observations.)

“C.”—TO VETERINARY SURGEONS.

Precisely the same as the above, “B,” addressed to farmers, with the addition of the following question:—

8. What, in your opinion, is the cause and origin of tuberculosis in domestic animals?

TUBERCULOSIS

— — — — —

NATURE OF THE DISEASE

APPENDIX D.

TUBERCULOSIS.—NATURE OF THE DISEASE.

1. This disease, technically known by the term tuberculosis or tubercle, is so-called because it produces in the tissues of most warm-blooded animals small inflammatory lumps or knots, the Latin word for which, as originally applied by Celsus, was "tuberculum."

2. The disease is known in the United Kingdom by different names, according to the parts of the body it may happen to attack, or according to the kind of lesions it produces; or, finally, according to its general effect on the body. Thus, it is commonly called phthisis or consumption, pining and wasting (the animal being called a "waster"), scrofula, strumous disease, cheesy inflammation of the lungs, caseous pneumonia, caseous broncho-pneumonia, tubercular pleurisy, the grapes, the grape disease (German *perlsucht*), consumption of the bowels, *tabes mesenterica*, tubercular meningitis.

3. For many years most of these conditions were supposed to be different diseases; we now know for certain that they are all forms of one and the same process, and caused by a microbe, *i. e.*, a parasitic micro-organism, which, growing in the tissues, gives rise to the tubercles, and which, by reason of its being thrown off from the diseased animal in quantity, renders the malady a contagious one. Tuberculosis, therefore, exists only in those localities where the microbe happens to be endemic—that is, however, in all European countries, and can only occur in an animal by reason of the microbe being introduced into its system. The microbe, or *vacillus*, thus forms the poison or virus of the disease.

4. The great discovery that the tubercles or foci of the disease contained a virus or poison capable of producing the malady when inoculated into the lower animals was first made by Kleucke, in 1843, but first described at length and placed on an undeniably firm basis by Villemin, in 1865. The nature of the poison itself remained unknown until it was discovered by Koch, in 1881, to be a rod-shaped microbe.

5. He found that this rod-shaped microbe was of a length about equal to or less than the diameter of a red-blooded corpuscle. When magnified very highly and stained with certain dyes it presented a dotted appearance, showing that the protoplasm forming its body is interrupted. This condition of the protoplasm is supposed further to indicate its reproduction by spores or seeds, such seeds or spores of microbes having, it is well known, greater vitality than the adult rod.

6. This greater vitality of the spore and the viability of the rods are, of course, points of the utmost importance; since, if the mucus, or saliva, or expectoration of an animal or human being suffering from tuberculosis be dropped upon the ground, flooring, or furniture of a room or shed, it is obvious that such secretions are, in proportion to the effect which exposure at the temperature of the air and drying may have in destroying the organisms and their spores, a source of danger to other animals or human beings who may accidentally take up the poison. From this it follows that the temperature of the air and drying for a very long period determine the survival or death of the infective microbes. These points, therefore, require careful consideration and examination.

7. The temperature which is most favorable to the growth of the microbe is that of the ordinary heat of the body of a warm-blooded animal, namely, from 37° to 38° C.= from about 98.5° to 100.5° Fahrenheit, but if the temperature falls to about 82° Fahrenheit such growth ceases. Though, however, cold thus prevents

its development, it does not kill it; whereas, if it be kept at a temperature of about 107.5° Fahrenheit for several weeks the organism gradually becomes exhausted, and dies.

8. It is obvious, from these facts, that if bacilli or their spores be scattered on the ground or elsewhere at the ordinary temperature of the outer air in our climate they will not grow, although they may fall upon a suitable soil. On the other hand, they will not be killed; and moreover, the temperature of some dairy sheds in the summer may approach the point at which the development of the organisms outside the body would be possible. It is only, therefore, under these latter circumstances to be feared that, in this country, these tubercle microbes will grow and develop outside the body.

9. The other condition—drying—is, in the case of most microbes, a very important one, since few resist desiccation. Numerous experiments, however, have been made upon expectoration containing the bacilli. Such expectoration has been dried during very considerable periods, viz., several months, and has also been successively dried and moistened for similar periods, and yet the bacilli have not been killed, and when inoculated into animals they have actively produced the disease.

10. It is abundantly evident, therefore, that the infectious discharges of a tubercular animal remain actively virulent in this climate for a long time after they have been cast from the body, and that stalls and sheds may thus become a source of danger, unless thoroughly cleansed.

11. The bacillus, under ordinary circumstances, of course, flourishes upon the living tissues of the animal it attacks; but its discoverer, Koch, showed that it could be cultivated artificially upon various purified, *i.e.*, sterilized animal fluid, such as the serum of blood, etc.

12. The tubercle bacillus does not attack all domesticated animals equally. Arranging them in order of respective liability to the disease, they are as follows:—Man, milch cows, fowls, rodents, pigs, goats, sheep, horses. Carnivora, *i.e.*, dogs, cats, etc. (very rarely).

13. From this it appears that the organism grows most readily in those animals which are omnivorous and herbivorous.

14. In all cases the female sex suffers more than the male, and in certain forms of the malady, as is common to all microbe diseases, young animals are more sensitive and more easily attacked than adults.

15. Further, certain unhealthy conditions cause a pre-disposition to contract the disease and receive the poison. Such are: (1.) Starvation; (2.) Deficiency of oxygen by bad ventilation; (3.) Exhausting secretions, *e.g.*, prolonged lactation; (4.) Possibly heredity (*Vide infra*, Modes of Transmission of the Virus, Article 29); (5.) Certain foods (asserted, but very doubtful).

16. (1). Of these, starvation is very important, since it causes degeneration of the tissues and diminishes thereby their resistance to the growth of the parasitic microbes.

17. (2). The deficiency of oxygen by want of ventilation has been, for very many years, recognized to be a fertile source of pre-disposition to tubercular infection, and to be very favorable to the transmission of the virus from one individual to another. This is so notorious that reference need only be made to the instances recorded in works on hygiene to substantiate the statement.

18. (3). Exhausting production of milk can be easily understood to effect, as seen in the gradual emaciation, etc., of milch cows by the constant loss of the fat, albumen, and salts contained in the milk, just those degenerative changes which reduce the vital resistance of the animal. It is consequently very probable that the especial proclivity of milch cows to contract the disease is, to a considerable extent, due to this factor, as well as to that expressed in Article 17.

19. (4). The well-known influence of heredity in perpetuating tuberculosis among stock is attributed by some to the transmission from parent to offspring, not of the actual virus, but of a condition of tissue which is peculiarly favorable to the

development of that organism. This view is naturally but a hypothetical one. Still, as it is held by many authorities, it is here stated. (See also Articles 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33.)

20. (5). Some foods, *i. e.*, grains, etc., have been imagined to favor the occurrence of tuberculosis, but this is extremely problematical.

MODES IN WHICH THE VIRUS OR MICROBE ENTER THE BODY.

21. The *bacillus tuberculosis* has been proved to enter the body, and to kill the animal by causing the growth of tubercles, in the following ways:—

- (1). Inhalation into the air passages and lungs.
- (2). Swallowing into the alimentary or digestive system.
- (3). Direct introduction into the sub-cutaneous or sub-mucous tissue by means of a scratch, or cut, or sore in the skin or mucous membrane. It is also supposed to be directly transmitted by—
- (4). Heredity.

22. (1). Inhalation.—Owing to the fact that the signs of disease are most commonly found in the lungs, inhalation would appear to be the commonest way in which the disease is contracted. This has been tested by comparative experiments, in which animals inhaled tubercular secretions so minutely divided as to admit of the bacilli being distributed in a current of air, thus closely imitating that distribution of the virus which occurs when a tuberculous animal coughs, etc. The results of these experiments have been almost invariably positive, the animals breathing such infected air rapidly succumbing to the disease.

23. Co-habitation, therefore, of the diseased and healthy animals is a fertile source of spread of the malady.

24. (2). Swallowing.—Numerous experiments have similarly been performed upon the possibility of the tubercular virus entering the body through the alimentary canal. In these experiments tubercular secretions, *i. e.*, mucus, saliva, milk, etc., portions of tubercles from diseased tissues and cultures of the bacilli have been swallowed by various animals (calves, pigs, sheep, rodents, fowls, etc.), with the effect that the disease has fatally followed the ingestion of such infective material.

25. It is obvious, therefore, that the digestive fluids do not necessarily exert an injurious influence upon the poisonous bacilli.

26. (3). Direct introduction into the tissues beneath the skin or beneath the mucous membranes.—If tubercular material—that is to say, secretions from a tubercular animal, or portions of tubercles—be introduced into the loose tissues beneath the skin or mucous membranes, the bacilli cause a local inflammatory swelling (*i. e.*, a tubercle), at the seat of infective inoculation, and then grow along the lymphatic vessels, causing similar inflammation of these latter, and finally reach the nearest glands. These also become diseased, and from them the microbes pass through the large lymphatic vessels, which subsequently discharge into the veins, so that the virus is distributed throughout the body, and the disease, at first local, becomes general, affecting most of the organs, but especially the lungs. (See pars. 37 and 42.)

27. Undoubted instances have been laid before us of such inoculation occurring; and others are on record in which the human being has become affected with the disease by the microbe entering the system through a scratch or sore on the hands, which have been brought in contact with tubercular sores or secretions.

28. Similarly, cases probably falling within this category have been recorded, and one or two stated in the evidence, in which a bull has given the disease to cows; and the converse has also occurred, namely, that a bull has contracted the disease from cows. In the former of these instances, of course, the virus may have been contained in the secretions, and it may have thus reached the ovary and so affected the system generally.

29. (4.) Heredity.—While it is undeniable that the disease runs through certain families or strains, there is considerable doubt as to whether this is simply because

the tissues of one particular breed or race are especially favorably disposed to nourish the tubercle bacillus, or whether the bacillus is actually contained in the ovum or spermatozoon, and so becomes a constituent part of the embryo and fœtus, and develops within the uterus. The former view has already been referred to.

30. In favor of the latter, it may be said that Baumgarten has actually, in the rabbit, observed the bacillus within the ovum; and further, that the bacilli have, by different observers, frequently been seen mingled with active spermatozoon.

31. Finally, in one striking case found by Professor Johne, of Dresden, an unborn calf of seven months' intra-uterine growth, was discovered to present numerous tubercles in its lungs, showing that if the ovum had not been inoculated it had received the virus through the placenta, which amounts practically to the same thing. Similarly, intra-uterine infection has been shown to be more than probable in the human being.

32. Against this view of the infection of the ovum and embryo it has been suggested that the disease-producing influence of the bacillus would prevent the ovum from arriving at maturity.

33. Whichever view be accepted, the solution of the practical problem, as far as it is connected with this part of the subject, is easy, as all breeders have discovered the infinite risk of breeding from tubercular stock. (*See also Articles 79-80.*)

34. It has also been stated that in-and-in breeding will, of itself, give rise to the disease. This is, of course, erroneous; but, no doubt, such breeding in one line predisposes to general infection if the virus is at any time introduced into the herd.

MODE OF ATTACK AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE DISEASE WITHIN THE BODY.

35. The disease, as already referred to, may attack the body of an animal in two different ways.

36. It may, for instance, be introduced into the blood, and be distributed generally over the body, spreading so rapidly as to make its entry difficult of discovery, and to gain for it, under this condition, the name of acute, or general, or miliary tuberculosis.

37. On the other hand, it may, as already stated, affect for a considerable time only the point of entry and the neighboring lymphatic glands, becoming subsequently distributed over the body from these latter. This is called, in the first instance, local tuberculosis.

38. Local tuberculosis is also occasionally seen to follow the circumstances which usually produce general tuberculosis; thus, in cattle the malady shows itself locally under the form known as grapes, where the pleura is alone attacked, this condition differing markedly from the form in which the alveoli of the lung itself are crammed with the tubercles and the other organs also affected.

39. Local tuberculosis is more common in man than in the lower animals. In him it frequently attacks one point, whatever be the mode of its original introduction into the body. In cattle this is very exceptional.

40. The distribution of the disease in the body is difficult to connect with any special mode of introduction of the virus, save, perhaps, inhalation.

41. Undoubtedly, in cattle the lungs and pleuræ and the serous membranes generally are the favorite seats of the malady, any and each of the other organs being occasionally affected. In pigs it commonly attacks the glands in the neck; in rodents the spleen, the liver, the lungs and the bones; in fowls the nose, mouth and spleen; in horses the glands; and in man the glands, the lungs, the joints and the nervous system.

42. Possibly, this predilection for the lungs, spleen, joints, etc., is dependent upon the rate of the circulation in those parts, the tubercle bacillus certainly appearing to grow best where the circulation is least vigorous.

43. The distribution of the disease and the bacilli in the body closely affects the question of the use of tubercular meat as food.

44. It appears that the marrow of the bones is affected at an early period, and that the bacilli may be present therein in considerable quantity before they discover themselves by changes obvious to the eye.

45. Evidence also has been laid before us to show that, although rarely, the disease may affect the flesh, and that the ordinary methods of cooking are often insufficient to destroy the bacilli buried in the interior of the limbs.

46. Further, although the bacilli may be found but rarely in the flesh, still the chance of their being present either there or in the blood is too probable to ever allow of the flesh of a tubercular animal being used for food under any circumstances, either for man or the lower animals.

47. The tubercles or inflammatory patches produced by bacilli in their growth in the tissues differ rather according to their seat and the acuteness of their disease.

48. If the malady is very acute and generalized in its course the organs will be found riddled with small greyish knots, varying in size from one-twenty-fifth of an inch (dust shot) upwards.

49. If the disease is more chronic these small tubercles coalesce, the centres of the conjoint patches thus formed become degenerated into cheesy masses, while the outer border becomes hard, tough and fibroid. This tough, fibrous tissue of the tubercular nodule is well seen in the grape-like nodules of the pleural tubercles in cattle. Finally, the cheesy matter may become stony hard from the deposit of lime salts within it. This occurs when, owing to the death of the bacilli, etc., the disease ceases to spread at that point, and the tubercle shivers into a calcified mass, surrounded by a sheath of dense fibrous tissue. Such remains of tubercles are, on *post-mortem* examination, not infrequently found, coupled with more recent lesions in animals previously supposed to be healthy.

50. The secretions from the organs thus diseased contain the tubercle bacilli, and are consequently infective in proportion to the activity of the malady. Such secretions are: the mucus from the air, alimentary and genito-urinary passages, the saliva, milk, urine, etc.

51. Of these, it is obvious that the fact of milk being infected is of primary importance to the health of both animals and of men, since milk has been proved both to contain the bacilli and to infect the lower animals, *e.g.*, calves, pigs, etc., while unfortunately it is becoming abundantly clear that by the same method of transmission of the virus the disease is communicated to the human being.

52. The general symptoms produced by tuberculosis are, when the disease is general, fairly easy of recognition, early malis commencing, and emaciation preceding the occurrence of the other prominent symptoms, such as a dry cough, etc.

53. When, however, the affection commences locally and remains for weeks, or it may be months, very slowly growing, and so producing the hard fibroid nodules before referred to, no symptoms may be manifest to a casual observer at all—in fact, the animal may be considered to be in a singularly fine condition.

54. Ultimately, however, in all cases, if the malady has the opportunity of developing further (*i.e.*, where the animal has not been killed in a well-nourished condition at the commencement of the disease), the emaciation becomes very marked, the milk previously abundant, though poor in quality, becomes still poorer, and also diminished in quantity. The weakness increasing with the wasting, there is distress on exertion; the cough and labored breathing indicating the degree in which the lungs are affected, and physical examination of the chest (*i.e.*, by percussion and auscultation) revealing their solidification and the pleuritic adhesions.

55. The disease in the lower animals always terminates fatally.

FREQUENCY OF PROPORTIONATE OCCURRENCE AMONG ANIMALS AND MEN.

56. Now that the unity of the various processes which the tubercular bacillus sets up is known, it should be clearly understood that it has been calculated, from the statistics of the registrars of various countries, that to this poison alone are due from 10 to 14 per cent. of all deaths among human beings.

57. In certain instances, even this number seems to have been exceeded, as in Paisley, where it is 17·5 per cent.

58. Its proportionate occurrence among animals has not been so clearly made out.

59. It appears to be certain that it is more prevalent in some parts of the country than in others, notably so in Ireland, and especially in Dublin, while it is much more common among milking cows than other kinds of stock. In Dublin the percentage of animals discovered to be affected with the disease in the course of application of the recent Slaughter Act was 4·9 per cent. In some exceptional cases the percentage is still higher, in others lower. Among Ayrshire dairy cattle, 25 per cent., Question 835; 50 per cent., Question 4262; 30 per cent., Question, 5371; 4·5 per cent., Question 5582; 3·5 per cent., Question 5360; 37·5 per cent., Question 7620; 2 per cent. of all animals, *i.e.*, cows, oxen, &c., killed at Edinburgh, Question 7684. In Germany the proportion of tubercular disease among cattle slaughtered appears to vary from 1·5 per cent. to 20 per cent., according to the district.

60. On analysis it will be found that, as an almost invariable rule, the low percentages given are those for herds fed in the open air most of the year, the high death rates being among dairy cattle co-habiting in sheds.

61. The relative frequency with which the disease appears among fowls seems to be not generally known, except to veterinary surgeons of large cities. Both from direct experiment and from clinical observation it is now proved, not only that the fowl contracts the disease from man by reason of its swallowing the expectorated bacilli, but also that it thereby forms a vehicle for the further transmission of the disease to man and the lower animals.

62. The widespread injury and loss it thus inflicts calls for legislative interference, which we will now proceed to consider.

63. Before doing so, we must direct attention to the fact that in the view of several authorities this disease is believed to be on the increase.

64. It is doubtful whether this is really so, for the reasons that (1) the apparent increase may be due to better recognition, and consequently more frequent notification of the disease; (2.) The general hygiene being improved, and this improvement having already greatly diminished the tubercular death rate in places where the malady was very prevalent, it is probable that the increasing attention given to hygienic requirements will still further reduce its virulence.

REMEDIAL MEASURES.

65. The two points to be born in mind in considering remedial measures are:—

- (1). That the disease can be transmitted to man from the lower animals, and from man to the lower animals, by one or other of the methods which we have already discussed, and especially by the ingestion of tubercular diseased meat or milk.
- (2). That it spreads from animal to animal.

66. The first of these, being in part dealt with under the "Public Health Act," is usually considered apart from the measures taken to prevent disease in cattle; but though this procedure is perfectly possible with most other diseases of the lower animals it cannot be applied to tuberculosis, for not only is the disease communicated from animals to man, but also from man to animals. Legislation, therefore, directed to the protection of cattle from tuberculosis should at the same time include such measures as will also prevent its communication to man.

67. In the first place, the question of curative treatment may be dismissed in a few words, since no cure or antidote is known for this disease, except in those cases (almost entirely confined to the human being) where it is only locally manifested, and in which, consequently, its foci can be encised and removed by surgical treatment.

68. This being so, it is evident that legislation must follow the two lines of (A.) Prevention, (B.) Extirpation.

A.—Preventive Measures.

69. These should include provisions for improved hygiene of cattle sheds, etc., (especially in the direction of providing proper ventilation, pure water supply and

adequate disinfection of stalls, etc., wherein tubercular animals have been kept). This has been partly met in the Dairy and Milk Shops Order, but its administration by the local health authorities is at present imperfect, and we would suggest that it should be much more stringently enforced, and that veterinary inspectors should be given more extended powers of entry into all places where animals are kept.

70. Improvement in the hygiene surroundings of animals should include isolation of all suspected cases (see also par. 87), precautions against the flesh and milk of diseased animals being given as food to others, *e.g.*, to pigs, fowl, etc., and care that fodder, litter and water should not be taken from one animal or stall and given to another.

71. Our attention has been drawn to the frequency with which animals obviously diseased, sometimes even in the last stage of the malady, are sold in open market. Although in England and Ireland, under the provisions of the Nuisance Removal Act, as embodied in the Public Health Act, 1885, the medical officer of health or inspector of nuisances may seize such animals, yet such seizure is rarely performed.

72. We find the veterinary inspector has no power to prevent such sales or to seize the beasts for slaughter, since tuberculosis is not included in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1878.

73. We further find that there is actually a regular trade in such stock infected with tuberculosis, and that they go by the name of "wasters" and "mincers," being frequently slaughtered in the neighborhood of the larger towns, to which such portions of the meat as are likely to escape the observation of the inspector of nuisances are sent, for the purposes of sale among the poorer inhabitants, and especially for the making of sausages.

74. We are, therefore, very strongly of opinion that power should be given to the veterinary inspector to seize all such animals at fairs, markets, or in transit.

75. Notwithstanding the uniform prevalence of the disease in Europe and elsewhere, there seems to be no reason to apprehend that, with our present regulations for the slaughter of animals at the port of debarkation, and for quarantine of those imported for breeding, there is any special danger of increasing the infection in England by introduction from abroad. The danger, however, exists in regard to the stock brought from countries which are exempt from slaughter on landing, and subjected to the ordinary veterinary inspection during the present period of detention of twelve hours.

76. It is, therefore, evident that the present rules for the prevention of the introduction of disease into the United Kingdom from abroad are incomplete. A further difficulty arises, owing to the failure of many veterinary surgeons to detect the disease in its early stages.

77. It is certain that hitherto, in those cases so frequently referred to, where the disease is stated to have been found to be exceedingly marked on *post-mortem* examination, although presenting no obvious symptoms during life, no proper veterinary examination was made.

78. As, however, it is impossible to suppose that extensive pleural or pulmonary disease would not be revealed by a careful physical examination of the chest by percussion, auscultation, etc., the statements to the contrary made on this point would not outweigh any legislative proposals, although such proposals would be partly dependent upon such proper and adequate physical examination.

79. Since all authorities are agreed that the disease is very marked by heredity, we think it highly desirable that breeders should, in their own as well as in the public interest, discontinue breeding from tuberculous stock.

B.—Extirpation.

80. In order to ensure the gradual extirpation of tuberculosis we are of opinion that it should be included in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts, for the purposes of certain sections of those Acts, so as to provide:—

(a.) For the slaughter of diseased animals, when found diseased on the owner's premises.

(b.) For the payment of compensation for the slaughter of such animals.

(c.) For the seizure and slaughter of diseased animals exposed in fairs, markets, etc., and during transit.

(d.) For the seizure and slaughter of diseased foreign animals at the place of landing in this country.

81. Notification of this disease should not be compulsory, because it may exist without developing any sufficient outward evidence to enable the owner to detect it, and its growth is so slow that non-notification of its existence, even in a large number of cases, would do little to nullify the stamping-out effect of the Act of 1878.

82. The powers and responsibilities of inspectors in ordering the slaughter of diseased animals should be the same for tuberculosis as for pleuro-pneumonia, according to section 51 (5) of the Act of 1878.*

83. An additional argument in favor of the slaughter of diseased animals is to be found in the fact that frequently tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia actually occur together, or are mistaken one for the other, so that in either case slaughter would be highly desirable.

84. Further: tubercle, though hereditary, is nevertheless much less contagious than the other diseases included under the Act of 1878; and it is clear, therefore, that the immediate slaughter of diseased animals would go far to stamp it out, though doubtless, owing to heredity, this stamping-out process would be gradual in its effect.

85. The annual reduction of the disease would probably be very considerable, and even should it not be so, that would not constitute any reason against the adoption of the proposed regulations, since, however small the effect produced, the result to the nation must necessarily be gain.

86. (3). Payment of compensation for loss of the animal.—As in the other diseases scheduled in the Act of 1878, so in this: the owner should be compensated for the slaughter of a tuberculous animal at the rate of three-fourths of its value before it was slaughtered, and the valuer should shape his estimate according to its worth to the owner, *i. e.*, as a milk-producer, or for any other special purpose.

87. If the animal should be one of great value, as in the case of pedigree stock, its worth might be determined by arbitration, and the three-fourths value paid in compensation under the provision before referred to.

CONCLUSION.

In terminating our enquiry we desire to state that the great number and importance of the facts which were brought before us compelled us to extend the taking of evidence beyond the limits which we had originally contemplated, and to delay the presentation of our report to Your Lordships. We recognize that the two subjects referred to us—pleuro-pneumonia and tuberculosis—are of the highest interest and importance, not only to the stock-owners of the United Kingdom, but also to the public at large.

We believe that if our recommendations be firmly carried out, pleuro-pneumonia may, within a moderate period, be exterminated in this country; and although we cannot dare to indulge in such sanguine expectations with regard to tuberculosis, we still venture to hope that much may be done to reduce its extent and to minimize a disease so dangerous alike to animals and to mankind.

* Sec. 51 (5) of Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878: "A certificate of a veterinary inspector, to the effect that an animal is or was affected with a disease specified in the certificate, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be conclusive evidence in all courts of justice of the matter certified."

We desire to express our thanks to Mr. Richard Dawson for the great assistance he has rendered to us as secretary to the committee, and to testify to the conspicuous ability with which he has discharged the duties of that office.

JACOB WILSON, *Chairman*,
 CLONCURRY,
 PATRICK STIRLING,
 J. BOWEN JONES,
 VICTOR HORSLEY,
 GEO. MACPHERSON GRANT,
 G. T. BROWN.

RICHARD DAWSON, Secretary,
 44 Parliament Street, S.W.,
 10th July, 1888.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON TUBERCULOSIS.

(By Professor Horsley.)

The foregoing report on tuberculosis, which I have signed, is entirely in accordance with my views on the subject, so far as it goes, but there are two points upon which I consider further legislation to be absolutely necessary. These are:—

1. Breeding.
2. Notification of the existence of the disease.

1.—*Breeding.*

Tuberculosis is notorious, even among the laity, as a disease which is transmitted from parent to offspring. This is a fact with which cattle-breeders are especially familiar, and which finds strong expression in the evidence attached to this report. Further, this generally-received truth has been completely confirmed by the results of scientific investigation, as is also duly set forth in the report. Considering, therefore, the extreme importance of this point, I think that the act of wittingly breeding from animals so affected should be made an indictable offence. The only objection that can be raised to such legislation—which, if effected, would prevent the dissemination of the disease among cattle in this country—is that, owing to the present state of want of knowledge among cattle owners, and even veterinary surgeons, of the early symptoms and physical signs, on examination, of this disease, prosecutions would occasionally occur in cases in which no fault could properly be attributed to the owner, and that, therefore, such prosecutions would be needlessly vexatious.

Considering, however, the extreme rarity with which such cases would occur, and that, as in the matter of non-notification, each case would be tried before district magistrates on its own merits, this objection is deprived of the force it might have possessed.

2.—*Notification of the Existence of the Disease.*

This point requires no explanation, since it is clear that unless the veterinary inspectors or authorities receive information of occurrence of diseases it is impossible to ensure the thorough carrying out of the provisions of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act.

That deliberate non-notification should be punished cannot be doubted by anyone. Objection, however, to legislation in this direction has been put forward on the same grounds as those upon which the prevention of breeding from diseased animals was contested. As, however, I consider that these objections have been already shown to have no weight, I recommend that both the forbiddal of breeding from diseased animals and the notification of the disease should be included in any legislation for tuberculosis.

VICTOR HORSLEY.

APPENDIX E.

EXTRACT from Report of and evidence given before a Joint Special Committee of the Legislature of the State of Maine, in 1887, ordered in consequence of an outbreak of Tuberculosis in a herd consisting of fifty-one animals on the State College Farm at Orono, which resulted in compulsory slaughter and burial of whole herd.

"REPORT.

"The undersigned, a majority of the committee appointed by a joint order of the two Houses of the Legislature to investigate the cause or causes of the late outbreak of disease among the cattle at the State College Farm, the loss of other cattle at said farm prior to that time, the disposal of the cattle therefrom, and the doings and correspondence of the commissioners on contagious diseases among cattle and in relation to the same, have attended to that duty, and after several hearings and an exhaustive examination of the facts, beg leave to report that the disease from which the herd of cattle at the State College Farm was suffering in March and April, 1886, was tuberculosis, a disease identical with consumption in the human family; that said disease, according to the evidence introduced before us, which is made a part of this report, is contagious, and readily communicated, by reason of the constant intermingling of the different animals of a herd together, and is transmitted from either parent to its offspring.

"The date and source of the first introduction of the disease into the college herd is unknown, but the evidence tends to disclose that it had existed there for some years, and that it had caused the death of several cattle on said farm before the slaughter of the herd in April, 1886.

"The outbreak of said disease there in the winter and spring of 1886 was the most malignant on record, and seems to have been caused by the collecting and intermingling of so many cattle, some of which, at least, were diseased, in close and well-finished stables, and by the thorough impregnation of said stables with contagious virus from those and former diseased animals. Little out-door exercise and concentrated and stimulating food were also potent factors in the rapid extension and progress of the disease.

"This herd appears to have been thoroughly inbred, which fact caused the disease to develop in an unusually severe form."

Professor Winchester, of Lawrence, Mass., a veterinary surgeon and a member of the Board of Cattle Commission of Massachusetts, has had considerable experience of tuberculosis, and both that and his studies teach that it is both hereditary and contagious, and is taken into the system by breathing, and is identical with tuberculosis in man, and may be carried from man to bovine, and there is evidence to show from bovine to man, although necessarily this is hard to prove, on account of the impossibility of conducting experiments.

Professor Michener, Professor of Cattle Pathology and Obstetrics of the American Veterinary College, at New York, who examined this herd, and advises on it, states: "That this disease is both hereditary and contagious is proved by the fact that calves scarcely one month old were plainly affected, and that those animals lately bought and placed with the diseased cattle show, upon post-mortem examination, the initial lesions of this malady."

* * * * *

"Taking into consideration, then, the facts that a very large proportion of the herd (all, we might say) were affected with a disease communicable, not only from animal to animal, but from animal to man; that, in the future, death after death would occur yearly; that scarcely by any possibility could calves be raised from any of these cows that would reach maturity free from this pestilence; that animals purchased elsewhere and placed with this herd would (as past experience proves) soon become diseased, and that the barn itself is now infected, and must be left vacant for a considerable period, parts of it (floors, etc.) removed and burned, and a thorough and repeated disinfection be resorted to: it becomes apparent to all, I think, that the only safe and proper course to pursue was the one advised, *i.e.*, the slaughter of the entire herd."

Geo. H. Bailey, State Veterinary Surgeon and Commissioner for Maine on contagious diseases of animals, in reference to the destruction of diseased animals, says:—

"The owners will not do the work of destruction themselves, on account of the direct loss incurred, and therefore the Government, as a general safeguard to the herd of the State, should assume the task and the cost of instant destruction when the disease is ascertained to exist. One neglected case, that might have cost the State \$50 to destroy, would possibly entail a loss of many thousands of dollars to our cattle growers."

Professor Law, of Cornell University, in his report to the Department of Agriculture, of the contagious diseases of our domestic animals, says that "20, 30, and even 50 per cent. of certain herds that supply New York city with milk are affected with this disease. In some country districts can be shown large herds with 90 per cent. subjects of tuberculosis."

Dr. Blaine, Assistant Physician to the Willard Asylum for the Insane, at Willard, N. Y., in a paper contributed to the "Medical Record" on bovine tuberculosis, says:—"In proof that the disease may be acquired by the ingestion of tuberculous substances, allow me to call your attention to the asylum herd of swine, which numbered nearly three hundred head. These animals were kept in different yards—in one the breeding sows, in another the half-grown pigs, and in the third yard, which was adjoining the slaughter house, were kept the large hogs which were being fattened. The hogs in this latter pen had access to the offal from the slaughter house, where a number of tuberculous cows had been killed. Later in the fall a number of the large fat hogs died suddenly in full strength, and on post-mortem were found highly tuberculous. The disease, however, did not present the same pathological conditions as in the cows. The disease seemed more especially confined to the abdominal viscera and the glandular system, the lungs being rarely affected."

Gerlach, the most noted of German veterinarians, says:—"There is every reason to prohibit the use of milk from cows affected with tuberculosis, and especially for infants, who mainly rely on this fluid for their subsistence, and whose powers of absorption are very active."

"The milk from a tuberculous cow had been used for some time in a cooked condition, but the cow finally became so bad that it was decided to give the milk to the hogs, but uncooked. The farmer's wife noticed that the young pigs fed upon this milk did not appear to thrive well; and, as in the course of a few weeks three died, I was requested to make an examination of the last one. I found the pig much emaciated. The mesenteric glands were enlarged, and found filled with tuberculous mass, with tubercles in the liver. In the course of a few weeks the remaining pigs of the litter also died, and were found tuberculous on being examined."

The following case of transmission of bovine tuberculosis to a man is related by Dr. Stang, of Amborach:—

"A boy five years old, apparently strong in constitution and descended from healthy parents, whose progenitors were exempt from hereditary disease, was attacked with scrofula, and died in four weeks from miliary tuberculosis of the lungs and enormous hypertrophy of the mesenteric glands. When making the autopsy it was accidentally ascertained that some time before the parents had to

destroy a cow which was affected with pulmonary phthisis. The animal had been a good milch cow, and for a long time the boy had received a quantity of the milk immediately after it was drawn."

The Maine State Board of Health says in a report:—

"Feeding experiments have conclusively shown that tuberculosis may be transmitted by means of the milk and flesh of diseased animals. Therefore, prevention has to regard both the danger to other animals and to man. The milk from cows with this disease, even in its earliest stages, or when suspected, should never be used for human food. The flesh should never be used unless the disease is in its earliest stages, and is so localized that the tubercular growth can be entirely removed."

APPENDIX F.

EXTRACTS FROM THE HATCH EXPERIMENTAL STATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, BULLETIN No. 3, 1889.

"ANIMALS ATTACKED BY TUBERCULOSIS.

"*Man.*—Tuberculosis is very prevalent in the human family, and was estimated by Dr. Robert Koch, of Berlin, to be the cause of one-seventh of all the deaths of the human race, while fully one-third of those who die in middle age are carried off by the same disease.

"Dr. Edward Hitchcock, of Amherst College, informs me that there were 38,049 deaths reported in the State of Massachusetts for the year 1885, and 5,955 of these were reported as caused by consumption. This is a larger proportion than that given by Dr. Koch, but it is probably only an average percentage for people living under the weakening influences of our modern civilization.

"*Ox.*—The bovine race shows a strong tendency to tuberculosis, especially in confinement, but far less when at large.

"*Swine.*—These animals are without doubt very susceptible to the disease, notwithstanding the opinion so frequently expressed to the contrary. The number of cases on record and the circumstances surrounding them place the matter beyond all doubt.

"*Sheep.*—The existence of tuberculosis in sheep is not yet well established.

"*Goat.*—Tuberculosis has been found in this animal in a few instances.

"*Hens.*—Dr. Ribbert, of Bonn, states that tuberculosis sometimes attacks hens, and may soon become epidemic in a flock. He found the bacilli of tuberculosis in abundance in the walls of the intestines, and also in the spleen and liver. Those most liable to the disease are the hen, peacock, grouse, guinea-fowl, pigeon and partridge.

"HISTORY OF TUBERCULOSIS.

"In 1864 Villemin expressed the belief, founded upon numerous experiments, that tuberculosis is a specific infectious disease, independent of other internal and external circumstances, and can only be caused by the introduction of tuberculous matter into the body, and that it can be transferred from animal to animal, or from man to animal, by vaccination.

"Toussaint concluded, from the experiments that he made, that no disease is more infectious than tuberculosis, and that all the fluids of the body—the blood, nasal secretion, saliva, the juices of the tissues, the urine, and even the lymph from the vesicles of the inoculated variola (vaccine matter) are all able to convey the infectious material of tuberculosis. These experiments were made upon cows, calves, goats, swine, rabbits and dogs, and almost invariably led to the development of miliary tuberculosis.

"DISTRIBUTION OF TUBERCULOSIS.

"Tuberculosis occurs in cattle wherever they are kept in domestication, but seems to be most prevalent where consumption is most common in the human family. It is almost unknown in Iceland, and is very rare in polar countries generally, but increases as we approach warm climates. It appears to be very common in Italy and Algeria; and, according to Henning, it is becoming more common in England. I am not able to give any estimate of the prevalence of this

disease among the herds of Massachusetts, but my attention has been called to it so frequently during the past two years that I am inclined to believe that the disease is more common than is generally supposed. On two occasions I visited one of our large city meat markets and examined the lungs still attached to the livers offered for sale, and the superficial examination which I was able to make led me to conclude that nearly half of them showed traces of the disease.

"It seems, from all we can learn, that a cold climate is less favorable to the development and propagation of the tuberculosis than a warm or tropical one. Veith states that the disease does not occur in animals living in a wild condition, nor even in those which are in a semi-savage state. Spinola confirms this statement, and adds that the affection is unknown in the Russian steppes, and is rare in elevated regions. According to Zippelius, tuberculosis is most frequently developed in deep and narrow valleys, or in densely populated localities. The disease causes the greatest ravages in damp and dark dwellings, with imperfect ventilation and drainage.

"IS HUMAN TUBERCULOSIS CONTAGIOUS?"

"A careful research into the literature of the subject shows that nearly all the celebrated medical writers, from the earliest times, believed in the contagiousness of human tuberculosis, among whom may be named Aristotle, Hippocrates, Galeu, Morton, Valsalva, Morgagni, Riverius, and many others equally noted in the annals of medicine.

"Demet, Paraskeva and Zallonis, in Syra, Greece, had succeeded to their satisfaction in producing tuberculosis in rabbits by inoculating them with sputa and blood from a man sick with consumption, but they felt that the demonstration would be more complete and convincing if they could operate on man himself. They therefore selected a patient who was suffering from gangrene in a toe, and whose death was inevitable, because of his persistent refusal to allow the diseased member to be amputated. An examination showed that the lungs of the man were perfectly sound and healthy, and that he had not the least tendency to tuberculosis. A quantity of sputa from a consumptive patient was injected into the upper part of the left thigh. In three weeks an examination of his lungs gave evidence that they were becoming diseased; and at the death of the man, in thirty-eight days, seventeen tubercles were found in the upper lobe of the right lung, and two in the left lung.

"Dr. E. J. Kempf gives an account, in the 'London Medical Record,' July 15, 1884, of an outbreak of consumption in a convent, in the village of Felinand. The inmates had been entirely free from consumption up to 1880, but lived a very secluded life, taking very little exercise. The convent was situated on high, dry ground, and was well drained and ventilated. In fact, the hygienic conditions were all that could be desired. In the autumn of 1880 Dr. Kempf was called to attend one of the inmates, a girl eighteen years of age, on account of a cough, pain in the chest, and a feeling of general indisposition. The girl came from a family which could not be called healthy, and from which a brother of the patient had previously died with consumption. An examination of the girl showed difficult breathing, hacking cough, loss of appetite, sleepless nights, weary limbs, a daily fever and difficulty in the apices of both lungs, as if from tubercular deposits. The patient was not isolated, but slept in the general dormitory with the other inmates. In a short time one after another began to show similar symptoms, and in four months after the first one was seized by the disease there were nine cases of consumption in the convent, some of them among those who were formerly thought to be exceptionally healthy. Four of the inmates died of the disease, and the others were lingering along with the chronic form. The director of the convent then took energetic measures to isolate the sick, and send away the ailing and the epidemic was stopped.

"IS BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS CONTAGIOUS?"

"Veterinary surgeons have for a long time insisted that bovine tuberculosis is contagious, and the veterinary journals are teeming with cases pointing unmistakably to its contagious character.

“The experiments of Villemin, Cohnheim, Toussaint, Koch and others, leave no possible doubt of the contagiousness of the disease. Dr. Koch inoculated the tuberculous matter from diseased animals into healthy ones, and reproduced the disease in every case.

“Galtier made a series of experiments on the resisting power of this tubercular parasite, and demonstrated that it retained its activity after being subjected to temperatures ranging from 18° below freezing up to 108° F.; that it also resisted the action of water, and the desiccating process, as well as strong pickle, so that the use of corned or salted beef from animals affected by tuberculosis is dangerous.

“Lydtin states very positively that the virus may be taken into the lungs through the inspired air, or into the digestive system with the food or water, or in copulation. If this statement be true, and there appears to be abundant proof of it, a single infected animal brought into a herd of cattle may communicate the disease to every animal in the herd. Infection by the generative organs has been doubted; but Zippelius and others state, however, that they have observed instances in which the infection could not have occurred by any other means. Bolinger produced tuberculosis in pigs by feeding them for a long time on milk from tuberculous cows.

“A large percentage of the animals suffering with tuberculosis are most seriously affected in the lungs, and it seems probable that these were infected by the bacilli which gained access with the inspired air.

“IS BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS COMMUNICABLE TO MAN ?

“From the nature of the case, we cannot expect direct experiments to be made on man with tuberculosis matter from other animals, but so many cases are on record, which seem to prove that human beings are frequently infected with tuberculosis through the milk or flesh of cows, that it seems like madness to disregard them. It is more than probable, that when children are fed with milk from tuberculous cows serious intestinal disturbances, or even tubercular meningitis, may occur.

“Dr. Anderson, of Ireland, reported a case of a calf which received tuberculosis from the milk of a cow with the disease in the udder. The wife of the owner, who had previously been considered healthy, soon developed a cough, with the other symptoms of the disease. Her child, born before the appearance of the disease, was fed with milk from a tuberculous cow, and died with the disease within six months. Dr. Anderson believed that both the mother and child contracted the disease from the cow's milk.

“Dr. Bang, in a paper before the Medical Congress at Copenhagen, in 1884, said that the danger of transmission of tuberculosis from the lower animals to man lies chiefly in the use of milk from diseased cows, because it is largely used in an uncooked condition. In one case which he examined he estimated that the bacilli of tuberculosis were so abundant that in drinking a glass of such milk a person would introduce into his system millions of these disease-producing germs.

“Dr. Nocard read a paper on the ‘Danger of Tuberculous Meat and Milk’ before the Medical Congress held in Paris in July, 1888, in which he said that ‘so far as milk is concerned, everybody agrees. The milk is not virulent, except when the mammary gland is tuberculous, but the diagnosis of this localization is difficult, and often impossible, and one must treat all tuberculous cows as if the gland was always invaded.’

“Prof. Walley stated, at a recent meeting of the British Medical Association, that if there was no direct evidence of the transmission of tuberculosis from animals to man, there was a vast amount of indirect evidence. He said he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that it was communicable from animals to man, and back again from man to animals, in every possible shape and form. He also expressed the opinion that it might be transmitted from tuberculous hens through their eggs.

“WHAT MEASURES SHOULD BE TAKEN TO AVOID THE CONTAGION.

“The bacilli, as has already been stated, may gain entrance into the body through the inhaled air, with the food and drink, or with the genital organs, and in the case of man it may be inoculated into the body with vaccine matter, if this, by any chance be taken from an infected animal. This fact suggests that the utmost care should be used in selecting vaccine matter.

“Tuberculosis can be successfully combatted only by destroying the means of infection, and, as Dr. Johnes says, we must look upon the sputa of consumptive persons, as well as substances polluted by the same, and animals having the disease, as the centres of infection.

“The Council of Hygiene, of the Department of the Seine, published the following rules for preventing the propagation of tuberculosis, in the “Medical Gazette” of Paris, February 27, 1886:—

“The most active agent in the transmission of tuberculosis is the sputum, which should, therefore, never be deposited on the floor or on the linen, where it may be converted into a dangerous element.

“The patient in question must be instructed to expectorate into vessels containing sawdust, the contents of which must be daily thrown into the fire, and the vessels themselves washed in boiling water at least once a day.

“The furnished apartment of a consumptive patient, especially in case of death, must be thoroughly disinfected, together with all bedding, and the clothing of such a patient must not be used until it has been subjected to the action of steam.

“Since sheep are far less susceptible to tuberculosis than cattle, it would be far safer to recommend the rare flesh of that animal for sickly children and adult invalids than rare beef.”

“Dr. Johnes gives the following very sensible recommendations, which may prove useful to farmers and stock-breeders in stamping out this disease in their herds.

“All tuberculous animals, or those with tuberculous tendencies, must be unconditionally excluded from breeding.

“All animals diseased with tuberculosis must be separated from healthy ones, and immediately slaughtered. Suspected ones should be treated in the same manner.

“Stables in which such animals have been kept must be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected.

“Everything tending to cause a predisposition to disease must be carefully avoided, and great care given to ventilation, diet, exercise and exposure.

“There ought to be a careful and critical supervision, at the public expense, of all slaughter houses and of the meat offered for sale in our markets, and also frequent examinations of the herds kept for supplying the public with milk, butter and cheese; but as this will not probably be secured immediately, it is a wise precaution, adopted in many families, to boil all the milk and to cook thoroughly all the meat used. Even then we shall have to take our chances on the butter and cheese used, since it is impracticable to boil the milk before the manufacture of these products.

“It has been shown that boiling or roasting in the ordinary way is not sufficient to destroy the germs in the centre of large pieces of meat, and that the bacilli will not be destroyed unless the heat is sufficient to change the color of the animal juices. It has also been shown that a temperature of 185° F is sufficient to destroy the virulence of tuberculous milk, and that this temperature will not change its taste.”

THE EVIDENCE



PART I

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 28th February, 1889.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met this morning, Mr. White (Renfrew), Chairman, presiding.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Lowe is here in accordance with the request of the committee, to give us such information as is in the possession of the Department respecting immigration. I think the better way would be to let Mr. Lowe make his statement, and leave any question which it is desired to ask him until the close, rather than during the progress of his statement.

MR. LOWE.—I will endeavor to make the statement of facts I have to give as brief as possible. In the first place, following the practice of previous meetings, we have given the numbers of immigrants arriving. I think it will not be necessary for me to go into much detail of these, for the reason that the report of the Minister is now before the House, containing very full particulars. I may, however, state that the gross immigration—that is, settlers in Canada—during the year amounted to the number of 88,766. That is an increase, in round numbers, of about 4,000 over the previous year, the figures apparently being on the up grade, having gradually risen from 69,000, in round numbers, to the present figure. There is also a noticeable feature in our returns, and that is the entries at the Custom houses with settlers' goods. These, I may explain, are a registration. They are taken down name by name. The total number of these during the year were 36,660, against 29,800 the previous year—again on the up grade. Another point of interest is the number of settlers reported to have gone to the North-West during the year. That is 29,685, as nearly as can be ascertained by the agents at the various points. I give these figures as an approximation. Possibly the actual figures would rather be in excess, as we have subjected these to as sharp a criticism as possible. That is an increase again over the previous year, the total number of the previous year being 21,685. These figures include both immigrants from other countries and migrants from the older Provinces. The figures are not by any means so large as those during what may be called the "boom" years, when there were 58,000 and 42,000 in a year, but they are very much larger than in intervening years—as in 1885, for instance, the figures had gone down to about 7,000. It is also of interest to state the amount of money and effects brought in by settlers during the year. So far as ascertained by our agents, we have the large sum of \$2,500,000 in round numbers, and the reported values of entries of settlers' goods was \$1,180,000—making considerable figures of values. There is a further point, and that relates to the occupations of the immigrants arriving. We have a registration at the ports of Halifax and Quebec, but elsewhere throughout the Dominion we have no means of ascertaining the fact of occupations, but those coming in at those two ports may be accepted as a sort of test—at least, they are proportionate to the numbers. Among the total number of entries by the St. Lawrence of 28,530, there were 14,069 farmers, 11,956 laborers, 998 mechanics and 70 professional men. That is of stated occupations in a total number of 28,530 out of 88,000 in round numbers. At Halifax the figures are somewhat smaller. The total arrivals at that port from all parts was 19,589. There were among these 2,000 farmers, 6,000 laborers, 700 mechanics, 263 clerks and traders, and 1,659 female servants.

There is next the question of the children who have been brought out by charitable societies and individuals during the year. The total number of these, as detailed in the report of the Minister, are 1,622, and these are cared for by the societies and benevolent persons who bring them out, most of them having receiving homes in this country. On this point I may mention that in accordance with the suggestions made by the committee last session it was ordered that there should be

a medical inspection of each child before embarking. The societies and benevolent persons who have had charge of these children have been quite willing to fall in with that suggestion; in fact, they have accepted it as something that might be of service to them in their operations, rather than a drawback. That has been carried out. There is still one further point in reference to children, and that has relation to the class of paupers; I mean paupers proper—that is, those who have received help from the State as a means of subsistence. As regards children of this class, no very large numbers have been brought out, but the greatest care has been exercised with them. Miss Rye, who is largely engaged in this work, wrote me a letter on the 15th inst., in which she stated that out of 100 of these children brought out by her during the year only six remained at the Home. She calls them the “residium,” and she sends me a photograph of those six. (Witness handed photograph to the committee.) The committee, after looking at that, will see that they have a very good appearance, to say the least. With regard, also, to the class of paupers which is connected with this point, I may state to the committee that the High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, has an agreement with the Local Government Board, by virtue of which no paupers are allowed to embark for Canada without his previous consent, and that consent is never given unless a very careful inspection shall have established the fact of the entire suitability of the immigrants, and also the further fact that when they come to this country they have friends to look after them. The consequence of that arrangement is that very few paupers have come to the country, and none have become burdens on the charities.

Dr. FERGUSON.—Has there been a standard of suitability laid down by the Department to guide Sir Charles Tupper, or is he to exercise his individual opinion?

Mr. LOWE.—It is an individual opinion as to the suitability of the paupers, with the further check of a requirement that the applicants shall have friends in this country to take care of them on arrival.

By Mr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—I would ask if there is a medical examination of these children made, directly or indirectly, by the Canadian Government, or is a medical man provided by parties wishing to bring in the children? A.—We have not appointed a medical man. It is an understanding with the High Commissioner, on official request of the Minister of Agriculture.

GENERAL LAURIE.—I would like to say one thing about children, which would to some extent be an answer to what Dr. Macdonald requires. In the case of Mrs. Birt's children, she had 226 children prepared for immigration. She keeps them under supervision for from two to four months, and during that time she culled these 226 to 168, taking only those she considered suitable. The effect of the present system is, that at her own expense she has to take back any children that are not suitable. That is practically a fine against bringing out any children who may not give satisfaction.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I would suggest that any questions which the committee desire to ask had better be asked, if convenient, after Mr. Lowe has made his statement.

Mr. LOWE.—Next comes the question of paupers proper. I stated at the last meeting of the committee, and subsequently in corroboration during the recess, at the request of the Minister, that it is a fact that not a single pauper had been shown to have arrived who was in any way a burden on any charity, notwithstanding all the remarks that had been made. I stated that fact with positiveness, and I repeat it now, that there has not been a simple case. I do not now refer to the simple poor. As regards that class, there is a great deal to say; but in reference to some remarks that were made in this committee at its last informal meeting, and at the request of the chairman, I think it well to make a further explanation. I happen to have in my

hands now a report of the Trade and Labour Council, published in a Toronto newspaper. It was officially addressed to me by Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue. This report refers to a statement which I had made, that not a single pauper arriving in this country had been shown to be a burden on any charity or any public institution in any way. This report meets that statement by quoting from a report made to the United States Congress by a committee engaged in picking up evidence in cities, containing these sentences:—

“As no inspection is made of immigrants along the border between Canada and the United States large numbers of alien paupers, insane persons, and others not lawfully entitled enter the United States in this way. The number during six months was estimated at 50,000. In many instances immigrants coming to Quebec have, within forty-eight hours after their arrival, been applicants for shelter in New York almshouses; and the charitable institutions, Wayne County, Michigan, are filled to overflowing from this cause.”

Here we have the advantage of a specific statement, although it is in the form of an estimate. It is stated that within six months as many as 50,000 of the insane and pauper class have crossed our frontier into the United States and gone into their almshouses. During these six months they must have come by way of Quebec. Well, the total immigration by the St. Lawrence—that is, coming by the way of Quebec, during the whole season of navigation was only 28,000. That is the number of all the immigrants of every kind who have come by way of the St. Lawrence, so that the estimate in that statement is not only an impossibility, but it is a sheer absurdity, and I do not think it has even a tittle of foundation to rest upon. There is one further point in relation to the number of immigrants who become burdens upon our charitable institutions, or our jails, or our asylums, or who receive relief in various ways. Figures have been given which go to show that the numbers of immigrants in certain institutions in Ontario are larger than the proportion of the native population in those institutions. That, however, if admitted simply to be the fact, would not be conclusive as to the character of the total immigration into the country, for the reason that the unsuitable, or those receiving charity, will always crowd towards a large centre, such as Toronto, and will not be found to any extent in other parts of the country; but apart from the general statement, we have also in this report a statement of figures, which is a kind of thing it is always satisfactory to get, as it enables an appreciation to be made with some exactness. It states: “By instruction of His Worship Mayor Clarke, City Relief Officer Taylor recently prepared and furnished the city press with a statement of the number, nationality, creed, time in Canada and time in Toronto of those who applied to him for assistance during the year ending 31st December, 1888. The number was 2,174; time in Canada, under one year, 432; over one year and under two, 343; over two years and under three, 820; not known, 258. Time in Toronto, under one month, 461; over one month and under two months, 164; over two months and under three months, 130; over three months and under four months, 96; over five months and under six months, 186; over one year and under two years, 212; over two years, 648; not known, 258.” You will observe that the number under one year in Canada was 432. I think that no more striking fact could be stated of the soundness of the immigration as a whole than that so small a number in relation to an immigration of 88,000 received relief. The fact, to my mind, is perfectly conclusive. I should explain to the committee, as I have done on previous occasions, that there will always be, in all large immigrations, a certain percentage of the unsuitable. Of the total immigration of this last year only 432 immigrants sought aid from the city relief officer of Toronto, according to that official statement, and I think the fact is a most striking proof of the soundness of the immigration as a whole.

Mr. TROW.—That is in Toronto alone?

Mr. LOWE.—Yes; the relief granted by that city.

Dr. PLATT.—About 10 per cent. sought relief?

Mr. LOWE.—Not that. The statement is that out of 2,174 of the total poor of Toronto, 432 were under one year in Canada.

Dr. MACDONALD.—How many immigrants of this year remained in Toronto?

Mr. LOWE.—I have not the figures by me, but it is in the neighborhood, speaking roughly, of 10,000.

By Dr. WILSON, (Elgin):

Q.—The total number sent there would be 10,000? A.—We do not send any to Toronto.

Q.—But they arrived there, and were distributed from that point? A.—Yes; and that is a further point on which it is well to explain. The Government does not send immigrants anywhere, nor do we invite them to go to any point. The movement is purely a voluntary act of the persons themselves. It is also to be borne in mind that these figures include the relief that would have been called for by the congestion at the close of the assisted passages last spring. For two or three months before the assisted passage system was brought to a close there was a perfect rush of immigrants, which caused a congestion in the months of April and May in Toronto, and which, for a while, gave the Department some anxiety.

Q.—Have you any means of knowing how many remained in Toronto, so as to draw a percentage? A.—We have the numbers that Mr. Donaldson received and reported as having passed through his agency. The greater part, or nearly all of those, went to the country, but some of them would return to Toronto, especially in the winter time.

Q.—It is a very unfair conclusion to arrive at. You take the accumulated poor of Toronto, and you draw your percentage from the fact that out of the whole immigration of the country there were only 432 who applied for relief? A.—My point is this: That at Toronto or Montreal, where there are great centres of population, there will be a natural gathering of what I may call unsuitable immigrants, a class which is inseparable from all immigrations. They always go to the large centres of population, so that the numbers of the unsuitable, as shown at two points, such as Montreal or Toronto, in relation to the settlers in the locality, form no indication of the character of the whole immigration as respects the Dominion.

Dr. WILSON.—I do not object to that. I do object to this. You may say that out of the total number of immigrants there were only 432 who were virtually seeking aid or assistance from the municipality. You place them all in Toronto. Are they all there?

Mr. LOWE.—Toronto is practically the only point in Ontario where we have heard of aid of this kind being required to be given to immigrants, and therefore it is fair to generalize on the ground I have stated.

Dr. MACDONALD (Huron).—I do not understand this point. Do I understand there were 432 immigrants applied to the charities of Toronto for aid?

Mr. LOWE.—I cannot say that. What I read to you was an official report of Mr. Taylor, relief officer, by the direction of Mr. Mayor Clarke, of Toronto.

Dr. MACDONALD.—These were the figures you gave as coming from Mayor Clarke?

Mr. LOWE.—Published by direction of Mayor Clarke. Mr. Taylor, the officer, stated that 432 persons who had been in the country one year had received aid from the charities of Toronto. It does not say whether they received one meal or two meals, or one night's lodgings or two nights' lodgings. They might have received only one meal, two meals or two nights' lodgings, and the whole 432 may have been distributed in the country and found good work.

Dr. MACDONALD.—In order that this matter may have any point whatever, it would be necessary to know what proportion this bears to all the immigrants that came into the city of Toronto during this year. This proportion may be very small

indeed, but it may be a very large percentage. It is an important point. We would like to know if this is the proportion to the whole number of immigrants from which these 432 were down as receiving charity from the city.

Mr. LOWE.—I cannot state the proportion in that precise way. Very few of the total number of immigrants who go to the city of Toronto stop there, and my belief is, that perhaps the greater number of those persons who received aid, in the first place went to the country, and afterwards gravitated to the city of Toronto. There is no means whatever of finding the exact number of such persons. They may come back by the railways, or simply walk in on their feet from different parts of the country.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Then there is no knowing whether this is 1 per cent. or 20 per cent.

Mr. LOWE.—No; I cannot give any percentage. I only give the broad fact of an exceedingly small number of persons, under one year in the country, receiving relief in the city of Toronto during the year, in the face of a large immigration.

GENERAL LAURIE.—It is probable that these people may have made application to two different societies, and have been counted twice.

Mr. LOWE.—That is altogether likely. People who desire to live on aid from others, or live on their wits, instead of working for their living, are ingenious in subterfuges.

Mr. PLATT.—If these figures mean anything, they mean that of the total number of immigrants who remained in Toronto 432 received aid.

Mr. LOWE.—I do not think that the statement can with accuracy be confined to these figures. I think those who received aid at Toronto might have a very small relation to the original numbers of those who first went there. My opinion is, that the greater part of these people gravitated from the country, they having been placed in situations which they found unsuitable.

Mr. PLATT.—The figures do not show anything.

Mr. LOWE.—They show that the actual number of all the immigrants who sought relief is exceedingly small—in fact, fractional; and the smallness of these figures is inferential proof of the general soundness of immigration work.

Mr. MCNEILL.—In seeking relief—do you know exactly what seeking relief means? I have been informed that it sometimes means applying for work.

Mr. LOWE.—It may mean applying for work, or applying for meals, or applying for a night's lodging.

Mr. MCNEILL.—Supposing all these persons were now included in this 432, or whatever the figures may be—suppose that included all the immigrants that went to Toronto; suppose we take a like number in the city of Montreal, and proportionate numbers in the other cities of the country. I think that would be a good showing that these people are all the people we find who are unsuitable immigrants.

Mr. LOWE.—Well, I happen to have in my hands another newspaper statement, written apparently with hostile intent to immigration, but it contains one further fact. Mr. McMillan, of the House of Refuge, appears to have been called upon by a reporter of a paper, and he states that 210 persons on a given night sought lodgings in the House of Refuge at Montreal. This, of course, included the whole of the poor of the city of Montreal, who took advantage of the institution, and then he adds that it includes a large number are new arrivals, without showing how many. We have here again the fact of small numbers; all the rest is indefinite.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Who makes this statement, that a large number of the parties applying for charity in the city of Montreal are new arrivals?

Mr. LOWE.—It is, according to these newspaper reports, Mr. McMillan, the superintendent of that institution. He says that the total number of persons who lodged at that House of Refuge was 210, but he does not tell the number of immigrants. He says a large number of them are new arrivals. "A large number," in connection with a statement of that kind, can only be described as the size of a piece of chalk. There is nothing definite about it.

Dr. WILSON.—About as definite as the other figures.

Mr. LOWE.—Well, the total figures of 210 lodging in the institution that night from among the whole of the poor of Montreal, a large city, in the neighborhood of 200,000, has at least this definiteness—it shows the numbers are not large.

Dr. WILSON.—He says a large number of these were new arrivals?

Mr. LOWE.—He says a large number, simply.

Dr. WILSON.—That would convey the impression that a majority of these were new arrivals.

Mr. LOWE.—It would convey the impression, on my mind, that an indefinite small number was stated.

Mr. TROW.—I would ask, if we are not given a synopsis of the number or proportion of the arrivals in the country during the present year, what was the proportion for the year previous?

Mr. LOWE.—I cannot answer that question with precision, but I can state generally that it has been found that the stream of immigration has on the whole very well kept up. There happened to arrive during the months of April and May of last year, in Toronto, a very large influx. Extra steamers were put on, bringing a thousand at a time, but I do not think that the proportions arriving during the after months of the year have altered from the average of previous years. We are on the upward plane of immigration movement, and the passenger rate is now only £4, which is not very high.

Mr. TROW.—Tell the committee where the principal portion of those that arrived in Manitoba and the North-West are located. Have you any agents there who would give an account of where they are placed. They might be transient travellers?

Mr. LOWE.—As respects the portions of the country in which immigrants are located, I cannot state the particulars with definiteness in detail. I do not think there are any means of doing so, but it is generally known that in the Province of Manitoba itself there has been an unusual number of settlers this year. The local Government has been making very great efforts to see that immigrants are placed on lands within the Province itself. They have settled along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Large numbers have also settled along the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, very largely owing, I think, to the very active efforts to promote colonization by the land commissioner of that company. Also in South Manitoba there have been a good number. The numbers of immigrants reported to have arrived at Emerson during the year were 11,185, at Gretna 3,706, at West Lynne 933, at Port Arthur 24,318, making a total of nearly 41,000; but deducting the numbers of those who were known to have gone out, leaves 29,000 out of 41,000 as settlers in the whole of the North-West, as far as the Pacific coast.

Mr. TROW.—Have you any knowledge in reference to the nationality of those who came into Manitoba at Gretna—if any Americans came in?

Mr. LOWE.—I believe that movement is gaining in activity, and that it is now fostered by the Northern Pacific Railway. I cannot give numbers, in answer to the question of Mr. Trow, but I find that in connection with these settlers, returns of persons who had crossed the frontier, the number of 646 Americans entered the Province of Manitoba as settlers.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).—I would like to ask if this 28,000 that came into the port of Quebec—did all these intend to make their destination in Canada. A large number of those who arrived in Quebec intended to make their destination the other side?

Mr. LOWE.—A large number of those who arrived in Quebec were not immigrants to Canada proper, but simply passengers to the United States. We only put down the number of settlers at 18,700 as having arrived at Quebec, these 18,700 having stated to the agent at Quebec that it was their intention to settle in Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I just wish to ask Mr. Lowe if it is not a fact that the Department of Agriculture has a special agent at Winnipeg. I refer to Mr. Metcalf, whose special and only duty it is to keep a record of those who come in to settle in the country, and not only of their numbers, but of their destinations, and where they settled. If he is paid for that work, how does it come that the Department has no report to submit to this committee now?

Mr. LOWE.—There is a report of those who passed through Mr. Metcalf's hands, and that report of numbers will be found in the appendix to the report of the Minister of Agriculture, giving the precise count of the numbers of those who passed through Mr. Metcalf's hands.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—If I understood the answer, it is that Mr. Metcalf has nothing to do with any except those who settle on Dominion Government lands.

Mr. LOWE.—I do not say that. Mr. Metcalf's duty was to place himself in communication with as many immigrants as possible, and afford them all possible information and facilities to settle on Government lands, or settle anywhere in the Canadian North-West, and this duty I understood he has actively performed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—We have it now, then, that his duty is to put himself in communication with as many immigrants as possible and keep a record of where they settle. What I want to know is, what number of such parties has Mr. Metcalf put himself in communication with, and how many does he know settled in the North-West.

Mr. MACDONALD.—Has Mr. Metcalf made a report to the Government in regard to his duties, giving the numbers he has seen of the immigrants going into Manitoba?

Mr. LOWE.—I can get and produce the report of the numbers reported by Mr. Metcalf's office in a few minutes' time.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Is it in the appendix in connection with the report of the Minister of Agriculture? That has not yet been laid before the House. A.—We will have the report of the Intelligence Office in a few moments.

Q.—Is the report in the appendix to the report of the Minister of Agriculture?
A.—Yes.

Q.—I think the Minister said the other night that the appendix would only be down this week? A.—That was the appendix of the Experimental Farm.

Q.—While the report is coming, I would ask if the Government is cognizant that a number of the children brought out to this country are taken from the reformatories of Great Britain? What explanation do they give for taking children from the reformatories, where they have been placed for a certain term? Is it right we should be made the dumping ground of people who have been incorrigible and sent to the reformatory? There may be some explanation that will be satisfactory.

A.—The answer to that, in the first place, is that the Government has not taken any children whatever from reformatories. It is perfectly true that some children who had been placed in reformatories, mainly for the purpose of taking them away from their associations, or, perhaps, in evil circumstances from their parents, after they had served their time and again entered the community have been brought to Canada by benevolent persons. I do not think that there is anything to prevent

that. The Government has not allowed, nor would the law allow, any child or person whatever under sentence to enter Canada, that is, laboring under a sentence of court.

Q.—But I understand, from the report of the Minister of Agriculture, that these parties have come actually from reformatories. A.—There have been, according to this report, twelve persons who have been in the Red Hill Reformatory, six in the Buxton Reformatory, and two in the St. Conleth's Reformatory, Phillipstown. The whole of these came under the care of the persons who brought them out. That is a practice that has prevailed for some years, and we have not, in the Department, heard any evil account of these children. We have, on the contrary, had satisfactory accounts. The Department has had correspondence with General Laurie, of Nova Scotia, on this subject, in which he urged in the strongest manner that no steps should be taken to prevent the entry of this class. The whole number, however, is so very small, and I do not think it would be possible to say that a child who had been removed from evil associations, who had been kept in one of these reformatories for training for a certain time, and afterwards, when all legal disabilities had disappeared, that such a child should not be allowed to go into any part of the British possessions.

Q.—It is not the number that is involved, but the principle. If the principle is acknowledged by the Canadian Government that children of British reformatories can be sent out as immigrants, the number may increase from year to year. A.—I answer the question put in that form with a distinct negative. Children are not brought from reformatories, but children who had been in the reformatories, and respecting whom the sentence had expired, have in small numbers been brought out by benevolent persons, who have cared for them.

Q.—I do not understand the expression used in the report to be that at all. If a child has been removed from a reformatory he would not be sent as coming from that reformatory, but I understand from the report that these children have been taken from the reformatory and immediately and directly sent here. It was these reformatories that sent these children out, and if they had no control over them how could they send them out? If they had sent them out as free parties they would certainly not have been sent by the reformatories, but having been sent by the reformatory authorities, therefore they have come directly from those institutions? A.—No children, when laboring under sentence, are allowed to be brought from the reformatories to Canada.

Q.—It has been rumored through the papers this last summer that parties under sentence for crime have been sent out from the institution on condition that they would emigrate to Canada. You will remember, no doubt, that the reporter of the *Globe* or *Mail* called upon certain parties in Toronto, and enquired about a certain person who came here, and it was distinctly stated that he came here on that condition—that he was relieved from sentence on condition that he would leave the old country and come to this country, and the party who advised him to do so was interested in emigration. That party was waited upon, and he had to acknowledge that parties came to this country under those conditions. A.—I think that statement refers to some reports which were contributed respecting the self-help institution. They were afterwards enquired into and totally denied.

By Mr. BRIEN:—

Q.—You say that these children did not come directly or indirectly from the reformatory? A.—I did not say that. I simply say this: that children, to a very limited number, who had been in reformatories, have been taken in charge by benevolent persons; some of them, having been kept in homes or training houses, with a view to change of their surroundings and study of their characters, have been brought to Canada.

Q.—I see by the report of the Local Government Board that many of these children have been brought from Whitechapel, from among the very worst people. I think no assistance should be given to these children? A.—No assistance is given to children from workhouses.

Q.—Do not Miss Rye's children receive any assistance? A.—Not if from workhouses, nor is there any encouragement given by the Government to this class.

Q.—In what way do they receive assistance? A.—They do not receive any assistance.

Q.—How is it, then, that in the Auditor-General's report I notice that you paid \$2 per head? A.—That has no relation whatever to children from workhouses.

Q.—I do not understand that. A.—There is a bonus of \$2 per head given for certain children, but it is for children who are taken from parents or guardians by Miss Rye, Mr. Middlemore, Miss Macpherson, Dr. Barnardo and others. These children have never been through workhouses, or reformatories, or any institutions whatever. They are simply children picked up, so to speak, by these benevolent persons, and the support which is obtained for carrying on this work is obtained by public subscription in the United Kingdom. As an aid towards the Homes, the cost of distribution and the care of these children, the Department has given for a number of years back—I think since 1872—\$2 *per capita*.

By Mr. INNES:—

Q.—What do you call Dr. Barnardo's children? A.—They are of two classes—children who have been taken from their parents and those selected from the workhouses, but the children who are brought from the workhouses are distinctly separated. The Department does not give any bonus for these. It is only those who are taken from their parents or guardians by benevolent people for whom the small bonus of \$2.00 is paid.

By Dr. WILSON:—

Q.—I understand you to state that no children are brought directly out of these reformatories during the time that they are sentenced. They are to serve the penalty of their offence. Then I think I understood you to say that after they had served their term they are sent to some training institution? A.—No; not that.

Q.—Yes, yes; I understand perfectly well that they are then sent to some training institution and they are put under surveillance for a length of time, and then they are sent out to this country. Now, what I want to know is, taking your own words—I mean what you stated—if they be so brought they receive \$2 per head, which is, you say, contrary and in direct opposition to the course pursued by the Department. A.—It is a misunderstanding.

Q.—You say they went to some training institution; I merely take your own statement? A.—I did not state that.

Q.—Well, I certainly took what you said, and put your words down. A.—I will explain if you will allow me.

Q.—Now, I want to know what institutions you had reference to, that these children, after they served the term of sentence, to what institution were they sent? Now, if you will tell me that? A.—I can answer that question distinctly. I did not say that children, after being in these institutions, were sent anywhere. I stated that they were picked up by benevolent persons, who desired to better their condition of life, who desired to improve their education—that these persons took charge of these children in many cases and placed them in homes in England, and afterwards brought a few of them to Canada. I did not state that the Government paid any bonus whatever for these children. On the contrary, I stated as distinctly as I was able that no bonus whatever was paid for these children.

Q.—Does Miss Rye or Dr. Barnardo take any of these children? Are the people brought out by these people from these institutions? A.—I am not aware that either Miss Rye or Dr. Barnardo have taken any children from the reformatories. I feel sure that Miss Rye has not, and think the greater part of them have been taken to Nova Scotia, of which General Laurie can give an account. But any children from the workhouse which Miss Rye or Dr. Barnardo may bring are so brought entirely at their own expense, and the Canadian Government does not pay any bonus whatever for them.

Q.—Does the Government pay any bonus to those that are brought out from the institutions that you say General Laurie knows about? A.—No.

Q.—No bonus at all? A.—No.

Q.—Are you in a position to say that none of the children from the reformatories are taken by Miss Rye? Are you in a position to state that none of these children found their way here through Dr. Barnardo or Miss Rye? Are you in a position to state that? A.—I understand such is not the case. The classes are quite distinct.

Q.—You say, in your position as Deputy Minister, that none of the children came out in this way? A.—I say I understand that nothing of that kind of thing is done.

By Mr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—I find here a list of reformatories from which children have been sent to this country. We are told by Mr. Lowe that these reformatories do not send children directly; then, that the reformatories were not responsible directly for sending them. Then it is the benevolent parties who are responsible for taking them out of the reformatories and sending them. It is complained that these came out with Miss Rye's and Dr. Barnardo's children, and others of that kind, and they receive \$2 per head when they arrive in this country, so that this country actually pays for these parties taken out of these reformatories—no less than eight reformatories. I do not think that this is right. How would the United States feel if we sent boys from the Penetanguishene to the American Union? They would protest vigorously against it. If we wish to keep our people pure we will certainly put our foot on a policy which will enable children committed to reformatories in their youth to be sent to this country, when they bring the tendency of crime with them. I am not at all surprised to find that such a large proportion of parties brought from the old country ultimately are criminals. I understand Mr. Lowe to say distinctly that the number was not asked, but on the contrary the Government refused to give a bonus to any children known to come from reformatories. It has been stated that perhaps some of these children may find their way into the number of children sent out by Miss Rye and other persons, to this country, and accidentally the bonus may be paid on some of the children. I suppose that is conceivable? I suppose that is possible? A.—I do not think it takes place.

Q.—Mr. Lowe merely says he does not think it takes place. Is it not a thing for supposition?

GENERAL LAURIE.—Mr. Lowe has referred to me with reference to the boys from Red Hill. This is a philanthropic farming school, started by Mr. Gladstone and other gentlemen in England years ago, who felt that it was a great grievance that children of tender years ought to be sent to live with hardened criminals. Take the case of a boy of seven or eight years of age stealing a carrot from a huckster's wheelbarrow, who is taken up, brought before a police magistrate and sentenced, not to prison, but to a farm school, such as this philanthropic farm, where he is kept until he can go out and earn his own living. Then, with reference to their coming out to Nova Scotia, they had, in all cases, completed their sentences, and benevolent individuals subscribed money which had been placed at the disposal of the manager of the school, with which their passage is paid, and I have had four or five and forty in the last few years, and I knew no cases of any criminality. The boy who stole the carrots is a married man now with four or five children. We have a dozen, sir, of the most respectable storekeepers and traders in Nova Scotia from these boys of Red Hill. They are not undesirable immigrants; they are carefully watched. None are sent out, except those who earned, by long years of probation, a good character. The institution has no control over them, but simply to furnish funds when they volunteer to come. I do not think this is undesirable immigration in any sense. There is another point I wish to state about making application to aid new arrivals. Those who know the state of the labor market of the old country know it is a hard thing to save anything to pay his passage. I had a case last year of a man and his wife. The immigration agent wrote me that they were decent people, but they had no funds

whatever. He had been unable to get them work, and he would have to send them to the poor house unless something could be got for them to do. I took them into my house. They were not used to lumbering, but I made the best I could of it. That man and his wife are as good settlers as we can want anywhere. It would be a most unfair thing to shut our doors against people of that kind. We cannot expect everybody to be capitalists. They bring a good strong right arm and a determination to work, and I do not think we should turn our doors against them or forbid them the country. I know that in Nova Scotia we are so hard up for labor that we are glad to welcome it.

Dr. PLATT.—I do not think that this is the proper place to discuss or criticise the principles which underlie the system of immigration of this country. Our object is to discover, if possible, what those principles are, and save our discussion for another place, and in the presence of the Minister, who is responsible, and not Mr. Lowe. Mr. Lowe is here to give us specific evidence in regard to those principles and the manner in which they are carried out. I do not know that it is worth while to discuss here whether the bringing out of children of the class represented is right or wrong. It may be said that if many of those children sent out here had been in reformatories there it would have been better than to be obliged to put them after they get here. There is one thing which has struck me. That the Department having heard during the last year of the criticism made upon the system by the Labor Unions of Toronto has not been prepared to meet them more specifically than Mr. Lowe has done to-day. We are left in the dark altogether as to whether the statements made by the Labor Unions are correct or whether the approximation given by the Deputy Minister would lead us to any other conclusion. I think if we could get to some system of statistics it would guide us better than discussing principles here.

Mr. Trow.—The only difficulty I see is, that the Minister is not thoroughly posted in these matters, while Mr. Lowe is a thorough encyclopædia in regard to immigration, and it behoves this committee to get all the information possible. While on my feet, I may say that I do not approve of the system of distribution for the settlement of immigrants after they arrive here. I know in the United States, in Dakota and Minnesota, you can go to the railway office there and ascertain where parties are located. One agent seems to send immigrants to another agent, and all reports are sent, as for instance in Dakota, to Fargo. The result is that you can trace a settler in any part of Dakota or Minnesota. You go, however, to the agent at Winnipeg, and say you require land; he will tell you he has no knowledge of any land vacant in his agency, instead of directing him to some other agent, and tracing him from point to point until he is located and registered. It would be satisfactory to the agent, and friends coming afterward could find him. There is, however, apparently no record kept. If they arrive in the country they may leave it in twenty-four hours, and no one knows anything about them, or whether he was known as No. 1 or No. 2, or by any name.

Mr. LOWE.—At the request of the chairman, I continue the statement of facts which I commenced to make. I think it, however, well to explain, in reference to a remark made by Mr. Trow, that although there is no means of keeping track sufficiently accurate for the purpose of statistics of the whole of the immigrants who arrive, we still have in very good operation that system of affording the kind of information of which Mr. Trow spoke. It is not only done in our offices—in our intelligence and guide offices and immigration offices—but it is done in the Canadian Pacific Railway and Manitoba & North-Western Company land offices, and also in the Manitoba Local Government offices. This system of aiding the immigrant arriving at Winnipeg in finding a location on which to settle, and affording accurate and correct information, is one of the most important means of settling the country. Its importance cannot be over-stated, and was not over-stated in the remark which Mr. Trow has just made. The conversational discussion which has taken place has

to some extent anticipated a note which I had made as to the general character and distribution of the immigration of this year. I may state, in relation to the general character, that the reports from our agents are to the effect that as a whole it has been of a very superior class, and that all persons coming to seek employment have found it. There have been no immigrants remaining over at the agencies for whom work was not found. I have made a note here as to the tests which it is possible to apply to ascertain the character of the immigration on landing. It is very difficult indeed to apply any tests beyond those indicated in the Immigration Act. I have already explained the kind of screen, if I may so speak, which we have on the other side, which prevents the embarkation of a class of paupers, who would be unsuitable for Canada. The class of simply poor persons has in the great majority of cases proved to be the best for settlement in this country, that is to say, a man having no means but his strength and energy would be more likely to succeed in this country than a man who simply comes with money, and without having in the same degree these other qualifications.

My next note has reference to the assisted passage system; and with respect to that, I may say it ceased on the 27th of April last. It had been in continuous operation since 1872, when it was found necessary to make very great exertions to meet the immigration operations which were then made by our neighbors, the United States, in what may be called the immigration market of the United Kingdom, and of other parts of Europe. The competition was then exceedingly keen, but the same state of affairs does not now seem to exist in the United States as twenty years ago. The active agents in United States interests were at that time meeting us at every possible step, and by their representations making it very difficult for us to get any immigrants whatever. The assisted passage, which was never more than a differential rate—a reduction of £1 sterling from the ordinary rate, the assisted or reduced rate being paid by immigrants—was first established as an inducement to select Canada. Now, on the other hand, the United States are not by any means so keen to receive immigrants as they were seventeen or twenty years ago, for the reason, apparently, of a sufficiency of supply in their labor markets, and having very nearly reached the limit of settlement of their good western lands. There are yet large areas of lands open and held by companies, but not very large areas of the kind which formerly invited immigrants. There is also a further fact bearing on the immigration question, and having an influence on the numbers who come. I find by the last report of the Bureau of Agriculture of the United States that the total yield of wheat per acre in the United States during the last year was only 11·6 bushels per acre. It is a very low average, and it has been a declining average for a number of years past and I think that it has a most important effect, as respects the demand for immigrants. It means exhaustion of soil to a large extent, and curtailment of means for the employment of agricultural immigrants. We are, however, as against this, met by the competition of the Argentine Republic on the extreme south of these continents, which is now even more keen than the old United States competition used to be. The population of that country is not quite 4,000,000, and I believe the white population is not over 1,000,000, if it reaches that figure. It is yet a fact that they had an immigration of 200,000 last year, for the promotion of which they spent the large sum of £400,000 sterling; and by the recent advices which the Department has received, the sum to be applied during this present year by the Argentine Republic is no less than \$5,000,000. They are chartering every large steamer they can get. They are obtaining large recruits of immigrants from all parts of the United Kingdom, and parts of Europe—now actively in northern Europe. In fact, they are making a very sensible pull on the immigration market. I merely mention that as one of the factors which affects the stream of immigration from the other side of the Atlantic to Canada.

By Mr. Trow:—

Q.—Do they say anything of the climate? Is it a desirable place for immigrants from Great Britain to go to? A.—The products exported are mainly cereals, and

wool and animals. Meat is exported in the preserved state very largely. In parts of the country the climate is reported to be good, but in other parts the heat is somewhat excessive, and there is the drawback of injurious insects and poisonous reptiles, which we have not in this country; but we are informed that the Argentine Government are persisting in their immigration policy, and the fact that that comparatively small population which I have mentioned having increased the expenditure from £400,000 sterling to \$5,000,000 is a remarkable proof of this. The immigrants go to Buenos Ayres, on the River Platte. Steamers are chartered every week, taking out large numbers. Their passages are prepaid, and the Government take promissory notes for repayment. I have been informed that they obtain repayment of many of these notes; but if we may judge from our own experience of that kind of thing, a very large pile of two or three hundred thousand of these notes would not be a valuable asset.

By Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) :—

Q.—What is their policy with immigrants? A.—They are boarded for five days at the Government expense, and the Government follows the principle of our late system of affording them free transport to any parts of the interior they like to go to.

Q.—Do they give them grants of land? A.—The land policy is exceedingly liberal, the intention being to force the population and productions of that country to the utmost extent possible. I was informed by Mr. Lloyd, who visited this country a short time ago, who had been, I understand, engaged in Argentine immigration in connection with railway construction, that it was found to be successful, and that the Government had no sort of intention of going back upon the policy. That, I suppose, may last until the population becomes a little more dense than it is.

I have a further note in connection with the publications issued by the Canadian Government for promoting immigration, and also the assistance rendered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I think I stated on one or two occasions that the efforts of the Pacific Railway Company were active in promoting immigration, and I thought it well to ask the traffic manager, Mr. Tuttle, if he had any objection to giving me information in a little more precise form as to the work they actually did. And he writes me—I have his letter here—that the expenditure of the company during the three years, 1886, 1887 and 1888, amounted to \$222,400—that is, expended in direct efforts to induce immigration to Canada, which amount did not include an equally large one expended for immigration purposes during the same time in connection with their traffic department. Of course, an effort of that kind supplements in a very important way that which has been made by the Department of Agriculture in the past, but we are now withdrawing very largely from our propagandist publications.

Mr. BAIN.—Can you tell us anything of the details of their system in a general way?

Mr. LOWE.—Mr. Tuttle sent me this collection of pamphlets, which had been procured and distributed by his company by the expenditure which I have stated. (The pamphlets were here shown to the members of the committee.) The publishing and distributing of a number of pamphlets such as this would, of course, be very expensive. I have looked over the most of these pamphlets, and some of them I find to be very well done indeed. The Committee can judge of their appearance.

Mr. JONES.—Has the company any active agents?

Mr. LOWE.—Yes; they have an immigration system, of which Mr. Lucius Tuttle, the General Traffic Manager, has the control.

Q.—He lives in Canada. I mean an active agent abroad? A.—They have an agency on the other side of the Atlantic, and they have, of course, arrangements and ramifications with all possible agencies wherever they can get them.

The publications of the Department during the year are comprised by this list. (Here the list was shown.) If any number of the committee desires to look at them, I have brought copies of the publications issued by the Department. The total expenditure of the Department in Canada for immigration publications during the calendar year 1888 was \$23,534. I fancy that amount would be less than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's expenditure. But I must explain that half of this six months referred to the previous fiscal year, when the Department had a larger vote than during the present fiscal year. The bulk vote of the previous fiscal year was \$150,000, but the bulk vote for the current fiscal year was reduced to \$50,000. There was also published by the High Commissioner in England, during the calendar year, a number of foreign publications, including Professor Sheledan's pamphlet, at a cost of \$5,700 altogether. These pamphlets were printed in England, owing to particular circumstances.

The total number of publications in Canada was 697,600, at an average cost of $3\frac{3}{8}$ cents each; and in England the total was 304,967, at an average cost of $1\frac{7}{8}$ cents each.

The chairman desired that I should give the total cost of immigration during the year. The total expenditure for all immigration purposes during the calendar year—and I give the calendar year because it has reference to the actual immigration—the statistics of immigration being kept for the calendar year—the total figures of the expenditure was \$183,057; but I must explain that in addition to that there was an expenditure of \$43,444 on account of the assisted passage, the liability for which had been incurred before the commencement of the year, but it comes in the year's expenses.

Q.—Is that a part of this \$183,000? A.—It is in addition to it. The gross is \$226,401. That included the arrears for the previous year. The actual expenses of the year are the lesser sum. When these figures are applied to the total immigration it makes a very small *per capita* cost, but the *per capita* cost, I think I should explain, is always large or small in proportion to the activity of the immigration. If we should happen to have a very economical year and a very small immigration we should have apparently a high *per capita* cost, and on the other side, if we had an expensive year and a very favorable immigration we should have had also a small *per capita* cost. I may explain that these figures are very much less than those of previous years. In the previous year, in the calendar year 1887, the expenditure was \$313,891 a year, with arrears, bringing it up to \$391,000, or nearly \$400,000. The expenditure is decidedly on the declining scale. No assistance of any kind whatever, such as transport or assisted passage, is now given. We have caused it to be made a rule everywhere that the immigration must be entirely self-sustaining.

By Mr. BAIN, (Wentworth):—

Q.—Have there been any new pamphlets issued within the last year? A.—There have been no new pamphlets published within a short time. In fact, none have been published in Canada for some time past. We had Professor Fream's pamphlet published on the other side during last winter. In the early part of last year there were considerable editions of pamphlets published—samples of which I have laid before the committee—at an expenditure of \$23,000 during the calendar year.

By Mr. PATERSON, (Brant):—

Q.—I see one here written by Mr. Webster this year. Was it written this year or last year? A.—It was written at the end of 1887, I think.

Q.—Was that a trip he took on his own account, or was he sent by the Government? A.—He was sent by the Government.

Q.—Were his expenses paid by the Government? A.—His expenses were paid by the Government while on that trip.

Q.—He was sent with a view to writing the pamphlet? A.—He was sent to the North-West with an instruction to report to the Department the precise facts as to

the condition and welfare of the settlers in Dakota and the Canadian North-West; respectively. He travelled over a great portion of Dakota and our own North-West, in fact, he made a house-to-house visitation of farms, and gave us a report possessing so many facts of such interest, that it was thought advisable to print his report. It is contained in that pamphlet you have in your hands.

Witness referring to his general statement, then said, I have gone over now the principal heads of the notes I have brought. There are, of course, many details.

By Mr. TROW:—

Q.—Any statistics Mr. Lowe might think necessary could be sent to the committee and given in the report. A.—If any statistics are required by the committee I will make the greatest exertion to furnish them.

By Mr. PATERSON, (Brant):—

Q.—Is Mr. Webster regularly in the employ of the Department? A.—He is not regularly employed. He has been employed from time to time.

Q.—What is his business? A.—I believe he is a farmer, and, as stated in that pamphlet, he resides in the county of Leeds.

Q.—He has been with the Department for a considerable time in one capacity or another? A.—Not in one capacity or another. He has simply been employed as agent for the purpose I have stated, and for checking the efforts of agents of land companies and railway companies in the United States operating in Canada, the main object being to divert, so far as possible, the current of emigration from Canada to the United States into a migration within the Dominion itself and toward the North-West.

Q.—That would be his object, I suppose. He was through several counties in Ontario. That was his object, I suppose? A.—His duties would lead him through the whole of Ontario, and especially to those localities where there might be activity of movement on the part of the young men towards migration or emigration.

Mr. INNES.—What particular work was he doing in Haldimand?

Q.—(Continued.)—I suppose he took occasion when people were assembled in meetings to speak to them? A.—Mr. Webster would naturally direct his steps to places where there were exhibitions or any large gatherings of people. I have myself at exhibitions noticed the exceedingly active work of Mr. Webster, but I may state that I do not consider Mr. Webster to be a regular officer of the Department. He is only a man to whom a specific commission has from time to time been given, and I can say, so far as that particular work is concerned, it has been well done.

Q.—Would he have a special commission to certain counties one after another? A.—No; he would not have any special commission to any particular counties, and in so far as relates to the particular county that has been mentioned, I was not personally aware that he had gone there.

Q.—I am not referring to any particular county. He was interested in cheese, I think. He was pretty well up on that subject? A.—I do not know that cheese was his speciality in any way, but I am prepared to say that he is a man of good information as respects farm matters. That pamphlet which you hold in your hand I think will afford some proof of that fact.

Q.—Well, he was at any rate employed by the Department to go to the North-West and Dakota, and these other points? A.—Yes; during the specific periods in which he was employed in that service.

Q.—And he is paid a specific sum for each commission? A.—Not at all. For the time he is actually employed by the Department he is paid for that specific time.

Q.—Altogether, you think he was paid for about six months' service in 1888? A.—Yes; six months.

Q.—That would include all? A.—I do not remember the precise dates, but I can furnish them.

Q.—He was all that time engaged in the preparation of this pamphlet? A.—That is merely an incident of the work he has done.

Q.—What other work was he employed at besides this? A.—The engagement of the Department, in the first place, with Mr. Webster, was a specific one to visit Dakota, Minnesota and other parts of the Western States, in order to report to the department the position in which he found the Canadian settlers in those States, and then to go to Manitoba and parts of the North-West and report to us from the point of view of an Ontario farmer what conditions he found. The result of his observations is given in that report.

Q.—Was that his first engagement with the Department? A.—That was his first engagement.

By MR. TROW:—

Q.—Did he travel pretty well through Haldimand? A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Did he report on it? A.—I think not. Mr. Webster did not receive any specific instruction as to what part of the country he should go to, and he is not a constant employee of the Department. He is only employed from time to time, and very temporarily, to do a specific work.

By MR. PATERSON:—

Q.—In sending a person to make a report like this it would be necessary to send a very capable man. As I understood, he came a stranger to the Department. How did you satisfy yourself that he was the right man to undertake this work? A.—I am not able to answer that precise form of question. He undoubtedly was recommended to the Department, or desired to undertake that kind of work, and was employed.

Q.—The Department would want to know something of a man's capabilities. He would be known to you in some way? A.—Of course, the responsibility of employment rested with the Minister and the Government. It was represented to the Department that he was a man of aptitude and ability, and that was proved the moment he began to send in reports to the Department of the work he had done.

Q.—Is he still with you? A.—He is not at this present moment engaged.

Q.—Has he been during 1889, or any part of it? A.—He may have been engaged at the beginning of 1889, I cannot tell you the precise date; I do not remember, but I can bring the dates.

Q.—Do you know the nature of his duties during 1889? A.—In so far as he has had any employment from the Department in 1889 it would simply be for the purpose of carrying out the duties I have before explained.

Q.—This report is completed? A.—That report is completed, and it states its own objects. That is for the purpose of meeting the representations or misrepresentations—the very numerous misrepresentations by pamphlets and posters and all kinds of literature—of American agents in Canada. Mr. Webster's business was to counteract that. His mode of operation was to distribute publications and to call meetings by which means, I believe, he has produced considerable results in carrying out the objects of his employment.

Q.—That is his duty—to call meetings and explain? A.—That would be one part of his duties.

Q.—He would be rather derelict in his duty if he was going to other places and not calling meetings, but just going through the country without any special object in view. He would be neglecting business, would he not? A.—I cannot say that Mr. Webster might not go through the country at certain times when we should have no relation with him.

Q.—I am speaking of you having relations with him. You say he was employed in 1889. That is not many months. What has he been doing during these months? A.—I have no report, but I do not think he has—in fact, I am sure that he has not received any pay for 1889, and I cannot give you at this moment the precise dates of his employment, but I can bring them down if the committee desires it.

Q.—I think you said he was employed in 1889? A.—I said he might have been at the beginning, but that he was never regularly, but only from time to time employed.

Q.—When he was employed in 1889 what were his duties? A.—I cannot say from memory with more precision than I have stated, but his duties would be to diffuse information among every class of farmers, and particularly young men in the Province of Ontario, who would be apt to remove to the Western United States to obtain land, for the purpose of showing them reasons why they would do very much better by going to Manitoba and parts of the North-West, and the kind of arguments which he used I have placed in your hands.

Q.—Would he undertake to canvass them in rotation. Was there a route laid out by you. Would it not have been better to do the work consecutively in the different counties? A.—We have not mapped out routes for the whole of Mr. Webster's time. The practice, in fact, has been that Mr. Webster would make a representation that such and such action should be taken in such and such a locality, and he would be authorized accordingly.

Q.—You would bring your own judgment to bear on that question. You would ask why do you select a particular locality, and he would be able to give reasons? A.—I think you will find, in that report in your hands, an account of parts of the country to which Mr. Webster has gone for the purpose of our propagandism, and that these parts have been well chosen and the work well done.

Q.—You have satisfied yourself of that? A.—I have stated my confidence in it; but I do not pretend to answer for the whole of Mr. Webster's time. We are not responsible for him beyond the performance of our work. Certainly he is not a permanent or temporary continuous officer of the Department.

Q.—There are 50,000 of these ordered? A.—Yes; 30,000 or 50,000. Considerable numbers have been printed, but the demand for them has been very large.

Q.—Do you remember what was paid—the bulk sum—for that trip to the North-West, salary and expenses? A.—Well, the cost was exceedingly moderate. It is given in the Auditor-General's report. He was paid an allowance of \$2 per day for salary, and a further allowance of \$2 per day for hotel expenses when travelling. He was also allowed for railway fares, but his other kinds of movements did not cost much, as he generally went from place to place on foot. He went on foot for the purpose of going from house to house and farm to farm. The cost in relation to that and other services was conspicuous for its moderation.

By Mr. BAIN:—

Q.—The printing is now done at the Department here? A.—Yes.

Q.—Was the 50,000 ordered from the *Citizen Printing Company*? A.—The first edition of 30,000 or 50,000 was, but the second edition was ordered from the Printing Department.

Q.—He has no pecuniary interest in the work after this information became public? A.—None whatever. The pamphlet is simply composed of the reports he sent to the Department, and printed by it.

Q.—Is it the intention to do any more in that direction? A.—That I cannot answer. In so far as that particular pamphlet is concerned, the demand for it is most active, and I can tell the committee it is certainly very well written and to the point.

Q.—I see he says he arrived back in time to show his collection of products at the different fairs that were held. A.—That was a special part of his duties—to attend the fairs, show specimens and distribute his pamphlets. There is another hand bill of his, I think, you will find in that collection of pamphlets I handed the committee, containing a list of post office addresses of Ontario farmers in Manitoba and the North-West, stating the amount of acres they have under cultivation and the amount of yield per acre. The average of the results is remarkable and favorable. Mr. Webster's method is to post a number of these hand bills up. He nails them up to posts, or in hotels, or anywhere he can, and farmers are asked to "take one." A very large number of these hand bills have been in that way circulated. I can give

the committee a specimen if it is desired, if it is not in the collection. I believe this publication has produced much effect.

By Mr. BRIEN:—

Q.—There is just one question. Have the Government any means of obtaining the exact sources of these children that Miss Rye and others bring out to this country?

A.—No; not in the case of each child.

Q.—They have no source of knowing exactly the source of these children they bring out? A.—We have no report respecting each individual child. We are of course informed as to the classes from which the children are taken. Many of them are fatherless and homeless, found wandering about the streets. They are picked up by charitable people, cleaned and kept for a year or two, trained and educated, and also in religious exercises, and then, when considered suitable, they are brought to this country.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 3rd April, 1889.

The Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met this morning, Mr. White (Renfrew) presiding. Following were the proceedings:

The CHAIRMAN.—We have here to-day Mr. Webster, who has been employed by the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of inducing any of our young men in Ontario who were desirous of moving from the older Provinces to go to Manitoba and our North-West Territories instead of going to the United States. He has also extended his operations to some of the United States. He is here present, and I think it would be well for us to get some information of the nature of the work he has been performing, and its results, if he can give us such information.

W. A. WEBSTER, called and examined:

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—I understand you are employed by the Department of Agriculture? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long have you been in the employment of the Department? A.—Since the 30th of April or the 1st day of May, 1887, excepting a few short intervals.

Q.—What are the natures of your duties? A.—My duties are laid down in the document that was handed to me, purporting to be a commission, as it were, to ascertain, in the first instance, to what extent immigration agents of the Western States or railway companies' agents were operating through Ontario, inducing persons to leave Ontario and the older Provinces and go into the Western States; and after ascertaining that, I was instructed to go into the States of Minnesota, Dakota and the States immediately adjoining our North-West and Manitoba, and familiarize myself with those States, so as to ascertain from personal observation whether I considered they possessed any advantages over our own North-West for immigrants—that is, whether the land was better, and climate better, the rates of taxation and all those practical questions in which an immigrant farmer would be interested, and also to visit any neighborhoods there that were said to be Canadian settlements. I was to see as many of those settlers as possible, and talk with them. I was then instructed to go into Manitoba and portions of the North-West and examine our own country, to see how it compared with Dakota and those States which I have mentioned, and report the facts, from time to time, to the Minister of Agriculture.

Q.—In the discharge of your duties, did you travel to any extent through Ontario and Quebec? A.—I have travelled very extensively over Ontario, and to some extent over Quebec. Not understanding the language, I found my usefulness in Quebec was not equal to what it would be if I could speak that language.

Q.—Will you state what counties you have been in in Ontario and Quebec? A.—In Ontario I have been in Prescott, Russell, Carleton, Dundas to some little extent, Leeds, Grenville, Renfrew, Lanark, Frontenac, Prince Edward, Lennox, Addington, Hastings, Northumberland, Ontario, York, Peel, Halimand, parts of

Grey and Bruce, Huron to some little extent, Perth to some extent, Guelph to some extent, and a few others that I cannot just call to memory.

Q.—In your intercourse with the farmers have you found that when the boys of the farm grow up they remain on the farm or move away, or are desirous of moving away? A.—My experience is, that when the boys grow to be men they have to move off. My experience in that respect is that particularly in Eastern Ontario, where I was born and raised, and am most familiar with the people, and where the farms are somewhat small, possibly about 100 acres on the average—while it is more or less broken, leaving possibly about 60 acres of cultivated land—that while that would give father and mother support and some of the children, as soon as they grew up there was nothing at all for them to do, and they could not stay there, except possibly a younger son to take care of father and mother in their old days, and take possession of the old homestead, while the balance had to go abroad somewhere.

Q.—What was the nature of that movement, from your observations, Mr. Webster? A.—The nature of that movement, from my observations, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to look into. When these young men arrive at manhood it is but natural for them to feel that the time has come for them to begin to provide homes for themselves, and those who have a desire to be farmers generally begin to cast about to see where it was best to commence farm life. Up here in Ontario the land is occupied. It has been so for a number of years, and land is so high in the immediate neighborhood as to invite the young farmers' attention to the great West. That is the place which attracts their attention. This is where I found the danger resulting from these American agents and their literature. This literature is presented in the most attractive form to these young men, and these young men are much more easily captivated by this class of literature than men of more mature years, and the men who get there first and present their stories in the best shape and in the most captivating form are the men to captivate the young men. The result of it is, that many of these young men went into the Western States, particularly before they had a railway in our own North-West. I found numbers of those men in Dakota, who have told me with their own mouths that when they left Ontario it was their intention to go into Manitoba, but on going to St. Paul, Chicago, Minneapolis and these great centres, were met by railway agents, and they were induced to believe that it was better for them to go to the Western States; and they drifted into these States, instead of going to their own country, and changed their route entirely.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe, from your observations, that this movement towards the United States has been checked by representations circulated in favor of Manitoba and our own North-West? A.—I am as certain of that as I am standing here to-day—that the efforts put forth in the last couple of years has led to this. I am quite satisfied to-day that hundreds of men are in this country to-day on my own representations alone, outside of what others have done. What others have done I have not been able to see. There is now one going to the Western States where fifty went two years ago.

Q.—You visited Dakota, I understand. Was it in 1887 that you visited that part of the United States? A.—Yes; each year—first in 1887. That is where I spent most of my time—in Dakota.

Q.—Did you go about the country much, from house to house?

A.—Yes, sir. The plan I adopted was this: I went into a country town and I made that my central point. I went to work and looked over the town, listened and heard what I could from conversation, and found there places where farmers would likely gather, such as farmers' hotels, blacksmith shops and other places. Then I went to the municipal offices. There is an official there called the county auditor, who seems to have possession of all these municipal statistics, referring to the taxation, and rates of every sort. I go to these gentlemen. I get copies, as far as I can, from them. Then I take the reports, and acquaint myself with the figures and make up the return I wish. Then, after looking over the town, I would strike into

the country and walk over township after township within a radius of, say twenty miles—say, north of the town twenty miles and south of the town twenty miles—and after looking over the farms pretty fairly I go into the houses and talk with the farmers. I also meet them at their work at the place, and then go into the house and talk with the farmers and their wives. I examine their stock, and everything, in the most practical way possible. I would then go to another county town, and so on, until I looked over the north-eastern portion of Dakota. That was the part in which I was particularly interested. There was no place where I had the least reason to believe Canadians had gone. I know, as a matter of fact, because I had particulars of a good many Ontario men who had gone there before I went there, and many of them had been friends of mine in youth. I went there and saw the prospects and what they were doing, and I did not find one of them that told me he was glad he had left.

Q.—I was going to ask you what condition you found them in? A.—I found them not improved.

Q.—You did not find that their condition was satisfactory? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Subsequent to your visit to the United States I understand you visited Manitoba and the Canadian North-West, and in the same way going from house to house? A.—Yes; after I was in Dakota.

Q.—Please inform the committee of the facts you found there? A.—I am afraid it would take too long. I will have to bait it. I wrote a book on the subject, and I wish every member would take that book, and he will find out my opinion of Manitoba. I found a different state of things in Manitoba. I have been an old farmer for the last forty-five years, and I never knew what good land meant until I got to Southern Manitoba and walked that country over. I walked over township after township. I have been in every county in Manitoba, and walked over them as far as time would permit. I mean by walking—buggy riding and buckboard riding, as well as a good deal of walking. As in Dakota, every farmer I met I presented myself to him in this way:—I said: “I have come up here for the purpose of looking over this country and meeting the farmers and hearing from their own mouths the result of their successes and failures. I have two or three questions to ask you. Where did you come from? How long have you been here? Are you satisfied with your success since you have been here, and if you could sell out your property here for a fair price, and get the cash, would you take it and go back to where you came from.” Those were the questions I gave, and they were fair, and every man I asked those questions gave me one and the same answer. I never got one to state that he would go back, even if he could sell his property for a fair cash value. Ninety-nine men out of a hundred used this expression:—“You need not be afraid of coming to this country. This is God’s country.” Ninety-nine men out of a hundred simply made that statement. I may say, Mr. Chairman, in regard to Manitoba, that I visited thirty or forty residents of Manitoba who had lived in my county. Fifteen or twenty of them had been schoolmates of mine. I knew their circumstances when they left, and I visited every farmer and saw everything connected with their success, and I had it from their own mouths. They were well known farmers in Manitoba, and there is not one of these men—their names are on that poster there, and I had it from their own mouths, in connection with what I could see—who have not made five times as much money in Manitoba as they could have made where they were raised in Ontario.

Q.—How did you find the land regulations? I suppose you gave some attention to them? A.—Yes, sir; I did.

Q.—Did you find them to be more onerous in Canada than in the United States? A.—No, sir; I found the very opposite. I found that a young man, a friend of mine, went down into Dakota and tried to homestead, and he had to do this: There are things there in connection with the land laws that are not generally understood by a man who goes in in the ordinary way. Here is one way a man’s money is taken out of his pocket: When I went into a county town I travelled as a man looking

for land, and I am satisfied that I had the sympathy of the average man in Dakota more on that account. I went into a land office, and would tell the agent: "I am going into a certain township to look for land. Is there any Government land there?" He would look into a book, and if he answered there was, I would say: "I would like to get a list of those lands, so as to know where to look for them." He would take a pencil and mark the one or two sections that were still Government land unoccupied, and I had to hand over 50 cents for it. Well, now, then I found that by the time I got through with Dakota I had paid out a good many 50 cent pieces out of my own pocket. When I went over to Manitoba and went into the land office there I found a different state of things generally there. The agent examined the plans of a county or a whole district, and he marked off the good land there, and he handed me eight or ten of these papers. I began to get out my wallet, expecting to pay \$5 or \$6. I said, "How much is it," and he said, "It is nothing." Then I found, when a young man going into Dakota for a homestead, in the first place he has to be twenty-one years of age before he can apply for land at all. He had to be an American citizen. Then he had to live on that land for five years to do his homesteading, so that he was twenty-six years of age before it was possible for him to get his patent. Before it was possible for a young man to obtain a patent in the United States he was twenty-six years of age. When I went to Manitoba I found young men eighteen years of age when they had their patents. Many state that it costs \$26 fees, in connection with the fact of having to be twenty-one years of age before making application for a homestead and spending five years homesteading. He had to pay these fees in Dakota and Minnesota. The office fees were \$26. Now, then, over in Manitoba a young man, when he made application, needed to be only eighteen years of age. He went on his own homestead and lived there for three years, not being absent more than six months. After he had stayed on the farm three years, and on the day he was twenty-one years of age, he would get his patent, having paid, not \$26, but \$10. All it cost the young man in Canada was \$10.

Dr. FERGUSON (Leeds).—In connection with the pre-emption in Dakota, what is the difference as to the time they can make the entry, as compared with Manitoba? A.—I would not like to make a statement on that from memory. I have the Land Law here and the Settlers' Guide, and I would have to refresh my memory on that. It was in regard to the homestead I gave particular attention to. The young man is always looking after the land he gets for nothing.

By Mr. McMILLAN (Huron):—

Q.—Do I understand you to say that an individual must become an American citizen before he can take up land in Dakota? A.—Yes.

Q.—That is not correct. I have a large number of neighbors who have not even given in their intentions, yet they have settled on land.

Mr. COCHRANE.—They have not got their deeds.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).—I do not know.

Mr. WEBSTER.—I have the law.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Just read the law.

Mr. WEBSTER.—"Citizens, and those who have declared their intention of becoming citizens—"

Dr. MACDONALD.—Becoming a citizen and declaring your intention to be one are two different things altogether—you can declare your intention—you can only become an American citizen when you renounce your allegiance to your own country. When a person becomes an American citizen he declares his allegiance to the American Government, but when he declares his intention of becoming an American citizen he does not take his oath of allegiance.

Mr. HESSON.—What does the oath of allegiance mean, if it does not mean the intention of doing a certain thing.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Does Mr. Hesson tell me that my stating my intention of becoming an American citizen at a certain time is the same as taking the oath of allegiance? I am not an American citizen until I have taken the oath.

Mr. HESSON.—The result would be that under false pretences an entry would be made where a gentleman has declared that he intends to take the oath of allegiance. If he does not take the oath of allegiance he has got his land under false pretences.

Dr. MACDONALD.—The gentleman who is speaking to the committee said he would have to become an American citizen before making his entry. The law carries out our statement in that regard.

Dr. WILSON.—It was further stated, beyond the fact that a man had to become an American citizen, that he had to be twenty-one years old, and could not get his deed or his land until five years after, which would make him twenty-six. Now, it turns out that a man can make an application, declare his intention, make his entry and go on. What would require him to be twenty-six years old? That is misleading.

Mr. HESSON.—He said he could not get his patent until he was twenty-six years old. Mr. Wilson knows that it requires five years' residence there to get a title, and he could not enter until he was twenty-one. The witness is correct in that respect.

Mr. McNEIL.—He must either intend to become an American citizen when he goes there, and forego his allegiance or forswear it to the British Crown, or he would tell a lie.

The WITNESS.—I might just say, in regard to that question, that I am not a lawyer. I read the law as it is there, and it seemed to me perfectly clear. I know, as far as I am concerned, that if I had to declare my intention of becoming an American citizen I would make up my mind that I was no longer a British subject. That is my knowledge of the law.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have you reason to believe there has been an emigration from Canada in consequence of more favorable land regulations in the Western States than in Canada? A.—I have never met a man who emigrated on that account.

Q.—Have you met anywhere American agents operating in Canada, and are you aware what literature they are circulating? A.—I met some agents. I am aware of all kinds of literature, and invariably when I have come across this literature I have mailed a good lot of it to the Department. I got samples for my own use, and I was in the habit of mailing it to the Department. There is one sample of the literature (exhibiting a colored poster). That is very inviting to a young man:—"Uncle Sam's last gift: 18,000,000 of acres of land." I walked over thousands of acres of that land that was not fit to feed a gopher. That was stuck up all over in Western Ontario. Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me to read a letter in connection with that matter. It is the opinion of a gentleman who has travelled over Ontario even as much or more than I have, and has been watching this matter. This is a letter dated Windsor, 6th February, 1888. It is addressed to Sir John Macdonald. This is simply a copy. This, I presume, was passed over by the Premier to the Department of Agriculture. It was mailed to me, and I copied it and returned the original letter, which, I presume, is on file in the Department. I will read it:—

"WINDSOR, ONT., 6th February, 1888.

"SIR,—I take the liberty of enclosing two pamphlets handed to me in a druggist's in Tilsonburg. As a native Canadian and a lover of my country I detest to see such damnable tracts circulated in our country. No wonder our young farmers are going to that God-forsaken State, Dakota. I would like to see your Government appoint two, four, or a dozen emigration agents for those States—live, active, pushing men—talkers and pushers—who could and would induce thousands of good, solid farmers to come to Canada, say on the north bank of the Saskatchewan district, between Grand Rapids and Edmonton, which I consider the finest landed district in the world. Never mind the cost. The

country is a unit on this question from Toronto to Windsor, as we are 50,000 square miles larger than the United States. All the Yankees can tell is their country. Canada is all right, but you have not got the people. Hundreds of your personal and political friends—yes, and girls, too—say this is the time to bring in the farmers and save them from the drouth, cyclones, blizzards, Indians, land grabbers and grasshoppers.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. E. A. PATTERSON,

57 Anderson St., Montreal.

Representing J. G. MCKENZIE & Co., Montreal.

Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD, G.C.B., &c.,
Ottawa.

Mr. BAIN.—In what locality did you mostly meet these agents? A.—Mostly in Windsor—mostly about Windsor.

Mr. HESSON.—In Stratford and Berlin?

Mr. WEBSTER.—About St. Thomas and about Windsor.

Mr. BAIN.—Mostly westward?

Mr. WEBSTER.—Yes.

By Dr. WILSON:—

Q.—Will you kindly mention the name of the St. Thomas agent? A.—No, sir; I cannot mention the names of any of these agents.

Q.—Can you tell me by what means any parties are induced to go to Dakota? A.—By these agents?

Q.—Yes. A.—By showing the advantages that that country possessed.

Q.—Have you any means of knowing the means adopted? Have you any means of knowing how the agency is carried on? A.—That is, to whose employ they are in?

Q.—The agents at St. Thomas? A.—I have no means of knowing in whose employ they are.

Q.—Or who they are? A.—No; I don't know them personally. I met them around the railway station and in public places, putting up this literature and taking it around on railway trains.

Q.—Where is that literature put up? A.—Around railway stations.

Q.—What stations? A.—The stations at Sarnia, telegraph offices and hotels.

Q.—Did you say at St. Thomas? Name the places where the literature was put up at St. Thomas? A.—I don't know in St. Thomas.

Q.—You said St. Thomas was a principal part? A.—No.

Q.—Yes; I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, he did. I want to know where the literature is put up at St. Thomas, literature of this kind? A.—I am not certain that I saw any in St. Thomas.

Q.—Why did you say St. Thomas was a principal place? A.—I will tell you why, sir. I met a man and roomed with him, and slept with him over night in the Clifton House in Winnipeg, who told me he was the means himself; and I was astonished in Dakota that such a large proportion of the people I met there in the country happened to come from about St. Thomas. This man who roomed with me in Winnipeg said: "I have been the means, myself, of sending over—I will not swear whether it was 500 or 700." I said: "Are you a Canadian?" and he said "yes." I said to him, "I am ashamed of you." I said: "Why do you do this if you are a Canadian; why have you done thus?" And he said: "There is money in it."

Dr. WILSON.—This is not what Mr. Webster said before. He said the literature was very largely distributed, and he mentioned St. Thomas as one of the principal points, and now he tells me he met a man in Winnipeg who said that he had induced a number of men to go to Dakota. I want to know upon what authority you based your deliberate, plain, positive assertion that literature was distributed at St. Thomas—and you made that assertion. Now, I want you to give me some proof of the truthfulness and correctness of the statement which you made.

A.—The proof is just this: I say that in very nearly every railway station that I visited, particularly two years ago, in western Ontario, I found this literature everywhere.

Q.—I am not speaking of other places. I am asking you about the literature placed at the railway station at St. Thomas? A.—Well, I have it from this man that mentioned it.

Q.—You have it from this man? Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I happen to know the means whereby a number of people—and I do not pretend to say there are not a large number of people who went to Dakota—but I know it is not from literature. I have been in every station there, and I know there is no such literature there, and the statement made by Mr. Webster has not one single tittle of truth in it. That was not the means whereby these people were induced to go. I know positively, and I suppose we will find that, in the Dominion of Canada, more or less people have gone to Dakota, and to some of the other States.

MR. COCHRANE.—I think we are here to get the evidence of Mr. Webster.

MR. HESSON.—May I ask Dr. Wilson if he has not observed that literature himself? I have not visited a single place but what I could put my hand upon it, and I venture to say it is still done. They are certainly distributing that kind of literature, and have their agents working all over the country. One in my town makes his headquarters at the Windsor Hotel, and whenever they hear of a man who is in strained circumstances they assist him to get out of the country, and send him out west.

DR. MACDONALD.—I want to ask the witness two or three questions. He stated that he had travelled largely through the counties of Ontario. Mr. Webster stated in a former part of his evidence that he had travelled considerably through the Province of Ontario, and that he found a large number of our men leaving our country because the lands are taken up, and they have to seek new lands in Manitoba and the North-West. You stated this? A.—Yes.

Q.—You also stated that during the last few years that people have gone from place to place, and were able to induce or attract the attention of the young men to places in the United States? A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps if the whole of the questions were asked you would be able to concentrate your questions more on what you wish to ask.

DR. MACDONALD.—He stated that not one out of fifty that went to the United States a few years ago was going now. Will you kindly tell me where the other forty-nine have gone? A.—Well, sir, they are going to our own North-West.

Q.—Do you not know, from your knowledge of the emigration to the North-West, that it could not be so—that the emigration to the North-West has certainly not increased forty-nine or fifty fold; or you say there is only one going to the United States where fifty went a few years ago, and it is stated also that the number in our Province is fully as large as a few years ago. The question which naturally presents itself to my mind is, where do the other forty-nine go that used to go to the United States? Now, if the emigration to the North-West has increased very little, and you know it has, will you explain where you think the other forty-nine have gone? A.—They are going now, and they are going by thousands and thousands.

Q.—But you said a few years ago? A.—This refers to the last two years—the work of the last two years. I know of my own knowledge, having been over eastern Ontario in a thoroughly practical way, of hundreds and hundreds who are going to our own country, and I do not know of one who is going to the western States. I have met these people in thousands. I have delivered over 150 lectures within the last two years, and I have distributed two tons of literature. In all these large gatherings, and particularly this winter, I have not met one who told me they were going to the Western States, after the evidence was presented to them. They said they had no idea of going. Hundreds told me that they were going to our own country, although they might have remained here and plodded along, as they intended doing.

Q.—Then you do not make this statement from any knowledge you had from the records? A.—No, sir; my own observations.

Q.—Upon the supposition that it is going to be carried out this year? A.—I make it from the result of my own observation.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—I understood you to say you were in Dakota last year? Did you go there, to any particular part of Dakota, in consequence of representations you saw in the newspapers as to the state of the settlers in that particular district, and what particular part did you go to? A.—I was down through southern Manitoba, and I met a grain dealer representing a large milling house in St. Paul or Minneapolis—one of the two, or both. I met him at Gretna, and stopped over night with him. He told me he had just come over to Manitoba for the purpose of purchasing grain, and that he had an order in his pocket for \$2,000,000 worth of barley. I said: "Why don't you buy it in your own country," and he said: "There is none there; it is all frozen." That set me thinking. I said: "I am going down to Dakota to spend some little time there, and to see if the frost is worse than it has been in Manitoba." He said: "Everything is frozen there, everything is gone." I said: "Surely the barley is not affected. I thought nothing but the wheat was affected." He said: "The barley is gone, the wheat is gone, and the vegetables are gone." I said I would go down. I went through Pomeroy and Welsh counties, and I was in the town of Hamilton. I got hold of a newspaper, the St. Paul or Minneapolis *Tribune*, a paper which has, perhaps, the largest circulation, from my observation, of any paper published in the West. Here is an article which, when I read it, sent a chill through me. I made up my mind that I would investigate that matter myself. This particular place was Ramsay county, or one township in that county, and the reason that that county was referred to was that the parties seemed to have some friends in Minneapolis, but I found that other townships were similar; the township of Cleveland, in Ramsay county, was another. After going through Pomeroy, and Welsh, and Grand Forks, and Larrimore, and Devil's Lake, I stopped off at several places. I went into Ramsay county and examined that frost particularly. I have got some very good evidence here of the frost. There is some of the wheat that I found was frozen. I took that out of an elevator (exhibiting a sample of wheat in a bottle) where the man told me there was about 4,000 bushels. I visited these people on their farms, and I never saw such a state of suffering, and never read of it in any country in the world, except some of the worst parts of Ireland; and now, Mr. Chairman, I went straight over to Manitoba into our own country after. Wheat was selling for 30 cents a bushel at Devil's Lake, near Church's Ferry. I went to another town, 150 miles almost due north, and I found wheat was selling there at \$1.15 per bushel, and there is a sample of the wheat selling for \$1.15 per bushel.

By Dr. WILSON :—

Q.—Do I understand you to say that all the wheat in Dakota was frozen? A.—No.

By Dr. MACDONALD :—

Q.—Are you comparing the price of frozen wheat with No. 1 Manitoba? A.—No, sir.

Q.—Was he comparing the price of No. 1 hard Manitoba with frozen wheat in Manitoba? A.—I simply state the facts.

Q.—It is not fair to quote the prices in that way, and have the impression left in the minds of the committee that the prices are higher in Manitoba? A.—That is the wheat I found in both places. That is the best wheat I found at Devil's Lake, and some parts of Dakota they had good wheat. That is the best I could find in two elevators.

Q.—Can you tell me the difference in price from the best in Dakota and from the best in Manitoba? A.—I enquired into that as fully as I could, and I think it was

selling at 5 cents per bushel more in Manitoba. No. 1 hard was selling for 5 cents per bushel more in southern Manitoba than it was in Dakota. You can turn it up if you like, and look at the quotations in the papers.

Q.—Have they the same standard for wheat? A.—No; I cannot say; I am not watching that, so I cannot say.

Q.—You are speaking of the highest price in both places? A.—Yes; the highest price in both places, Mr. Chairman. Just before leaving Devil's Lake, I might say, I went over one particular township, the township of Cleveland, and I got some other evidence here that I think cannot be questioned, because they were the records; and in making the comparison I was careful, as far as possible, to get evidence that could not be questioned. Now, here is the financial statement of Ramsay, the county in which the township of Cleveland is situated.

Q.—What State is that in; is it in Dakota? A.—That is in Dakota. However, if time will permit for the committee to just go to work and take the financial statement there, the municipal statistics of the county of Ramsay, in Dakota, and go 100 miles north into Manitoba, and here are the official statistics of the municipality of Louise, in Manitoba. I don't know what gentleman represents that, perhaps it is Mr. Daly's constituency. This would prove everything in regard to the property of the people, the agricultural resources and the possibilities of both countries.

Q.—Are they adjoining? A.—No, sir; they are not adjoining.

Q.—A great deal would depend on that. We know very well that the municipality of Louise, in Manitoba, is one of the best spots in the whole entire North-West. Now, if you compare that special spot of Manitoba with other places we do not see the comparison. The comparison is not worth anything. A.—One is immediately opposite to the other.

By Dr. WILSON:—

Q.—A hundred miles, I thought you said? A.—Right opposite, nearly. That is the first place that you can strike in Canada in going north from Ramsay county. I went straight from Ramsay and took the first place I struck. I did not wander around looking for any special place in Manitoba.

By Dr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—What section of country lies immediately adjoining? A.—This Ramsay county is immediately south and a little west.

Q.—It must be a good deal south and west if it is a hundred miles distant? A.—There is probably the town of Towner between.

Mr. WATSON.—I say that this evidence here does not prove anything, and I shall tell you why. I do not wish to get up here and state that frost created havoc in Manitoba last year. That is a thing that no one wants to talk about; but we have some farmers in Manitoba, in what I think is the finest part of Manitoba, who have to import their seed-wheat this year—I mean, import from one township to another. This gentleman selects samples of frozen wheat in Dakota, which proves nothing. You might select the same in Manitoba.

The CHAIRMAN.—I submit that the best way of promoting immigration, of retaining our own people, is to give the facts as they exist. Mr. Webster pretends, at all events, to give the facts as he observed them himself. It seems to me that is the only way in which we can retain the people in our own country or induce the people of Dakota to go into the North-West. If the facts are misrepresented, that is another thing.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not say that it is a misrepresentation; but it is not giving a fair representation of Dakota to present these two samples of wheat.

The CHAIRMAN.—What I understand Mr. Webster to speak of now is the destitution in a particular part of Dakota. If no such destitution exists in Manitoba then I think the comparison is favorable to Manitoba. He speaks of a very considerable

district in Dakota where they were suffering from the frost. If a similar state of affairs existed in Manitoba the comparison would then be an unfair one; but, if no such thing existed in Manitoba I think the comparison is a fair one, and we should put the advantages of our own country before the people.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not wish to put the advantages of Dakota before the people; but to place a couple of bottles of wheat before us, and say that shows the state of Dakota, is not fair.

Hon. Mr. CARLING.—I think Mr. Webster has been invited here to give us an account of his trip through the State of Dakota, Manitoba and the North-West, and to give a truthful statement as to the condition of the farmers in each of those localities. I think it is to the interest of all Canadians, and especially to the representatives of the people, that we should have a correct statement respecting the two countries. Mr. Webster cannot have any object in misrepresenting Dakota, or in praising up Manitoba and misrepresenting the case before the committee. Mr. Webster visited Dakota and also Manitoba, and he has said that he did not go to inspect any particular district in Manitoba, for the purpose of finding good wheat and comparing that with the Dakota wheat. I am glad that the member for Marquette is here, because he made a statement in the House last night that all these statements by Mr. Webster were incorrect and untrue—that the statement with regard to agricultural implements in Manitoba being as cheap, or cheaper, than in Dakota, is not true.

Mr. WATSON.—I say so.

Hon. Mr. CARLING.—I would like to ask Mr. Webster if he has made inquiries as to the price of agricultural implements in Dakota as compared with prices in Manitoba?

Dr. WILSON.—I think we had better get through this matter of wheat, and not divert the attention of the committee.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—This is a sample of wheat which you took from an elevator at Devil's Lake?
A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you tell the committee whether that was a fair sample of the wheat in that elevator at that time or not, or specially selected? A.—It is better than the sample of wheat when I travelled over the township of Cleveland, and I saw with my own eyes. Now, then, the particular elevator I got this wheat out of, I got it so that I could go around and show the wheat of both countries for themselves.

Dr. WILSON.—Did you show it at Haldimand?

A.—I showed it in many places.

Q.—I am merely asking if he showed it among the farmers in Haldimand when he was there. I am quite sure that many members of this committee are desirous of getting at facts? A.—Well, Mr. Chairman, I could not remember each particular place I showed this in. I carried samples around with me, and I had them in a bottle, and called the attention of the farmers to them. At meetings I went around among the audience and I had samples in envelopes, and I gave very many of them away, and they took them home and used them.

Dr. FERGUSON (Leeds).—I was going to suggest this: as Mr. Webster is here, as the Minister of Agriculture has distinctly stated, to give in an intelligent way the condition in which he found the farmers in Dakota and Manitoba, and their prospects for the future, that he be allowed to go on and give us what he believes to be the possibilities for the farmers established in Manitoba, or whether our country is better suited for mixed farming, so that our people may be protected as much as possible, not simply depending on one crop, as they must be in Dakota—that he be allowed to go on. It would be a good feature of his evidence.

By Dr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—Is that a fair sample of what was in the elevator? A.—When I got this out of the elevator I asked the elevator man how much was in the elevator, and he told me 3,000 bushels. During the part of the day I was around that elevator there were a number of farmers hauling in wheat; very much of it was a worse sample than this, and the oats they had was of little or no value at all, so that I took that as a fair average sample of all that I could find in that particular place in the two elevators.

Q.—Was there any better wheat in the elevator than that? A.—No.

By Dr. WILSON:—

Q.—Did you get samples from any other counties than this one you mentioned affected seriously by frost? A.—No, sir; I saw some samples in other counties, fairish good wheat, which rated No. 2.

Q.—As a general thing, were there many of the counties in which the wheat was injured by the frost this last year in Dakota? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you learn how many sections or how many counties were affected more or less? A.—Well, I did. I could not take the time to go over all these counties myself. I took their own evidence. I have their evidence here. I have a report here of their own, and that was simply this: This is the St. Paul *Pioneer Press*. It says that in eight counties in Minnesota and Dakota they had a yield of ten bushels per acre. There is the witness I got; that is the evidence I got, and I thought it would be fair evidence. It is from the most important paper published in the North-West, and that is the St. Paul *Pioneer Press*.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—You say that is the report in the St. Paul *Pioneer Press* showing that the average was ten bushels to the acre. I see here a hand bill that I have seen in the railway stations, with the signature of W. A. Webster. Is that you? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You give a list of people, and the quantity of grain grown by each, and you say that the average of forty-five farms was thirty-five bushels to the acre. That was wheat? A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you visit all these people on this list and, do you know of your own knowledge, or from information received from these people, that this is correct? A.—I visited them. The great bulk of them are old personal friends of mine. I visited them for the purpose of seeing their success in the new country. They have been there on an average of six to nine years, and many of those who have grown these large quantities of wheat left my old county with an average of fifty dollars; and to-day they are rich men. To get that list I did not take everything from these farmers' mouths, by any means, because I thought some enemies of our country—and there seem to be some of them alive yet—might attack me on the accuracy of it; so I wrote to four men who were well known in the Province of Manitoba, and told them I was going to prepare something of this kind to offset the literature that Dakota agents were spreading around the country, and this has done an immense amount of good. I said, I want to get some information from the farmers in your locality, in the north, and west, and south, and—

Dr. WILSON.—I do not wish to interrupt, but it was represented that a large amount of wheat was injured in Dakota. That I believe is the charge. We want to make the facts tally, and we want to see if any section of the North-West was similarly affected, and whether the frost injured much of the wheat in the North-West during the year. Then we can go on.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Then perhaps a question of this kind might be put? Did you find in Manitoba or the North-West Territories a single township affected by frost as this parti-

cular township was to which you refer? A.—Bless your heart, Mr. Chairman, nothing approaching it at all.

Q.—Was there much wheat injured by the frost during the last season? A.—I was not in the North-West during the last season, but I understood there was some. In Manitoba some portions suffered severely from frost. I understood from parties living in the North-West, some of whom were friends of mine, that there was practically no frost in the North-West.

By Dr. WILSON :—

Q.—What proportion of the wheat in Manitoba was injured by the frost as compared with Dakota, and what are the relative merits of the two countries? A.—I am satisfied that from the result of my observations in both places—

Q.—But your observation in Dakota was drawn from papers. I suppose you drew your information relating to the North-West from papers also? A.—No; it was not from papers alone; I also went over several counties in Minnesota.

By Dr. MACDONALD :—

Q.—You state there that the average crop in Dakota was about eleven bushels to the acre? A.—I have said eleven bushels; but they say ten bushels.

Q.—Then you said you wanted to offset that by giving the farmers in Ontario the average in Manitoba, and I understand the average stated there is thirty-five or thirty-six bushels? A.—That has reference to the crop of 1887.

Q.—How can you compare one crop with the other? A.—I am not comparing them.

Q.—Surely, we cannot justify our own agents in misrepresentations if the Dakota agents do it, although I am far more interested in Manitoba than Dakota.

Mr. HESSON.—This is dated in June, 1888, and consequently have represented the crop of 1887. I know the names of some parties from my own neighborhood who could not be induced to come back to-day.

Dr. WILSON.—I will just say this—I think it is an unfortunate thing if we should attempt to compare the western States and Manitoba in a frozen year. Let us take a good year and the prospects of a good crop, and I say what the gentleman states is correct. An average in 1883 was thirty-one bushels, and in Dakota it was ten or eleven bushels. That was in a good year, with no frost; but when you select a year where the whole western country States and Manitoba and the North-West were affected by frost, I don't think it gives a fair comparison. Let me take any good year, and I say our Canadian North-West is far superior to Minnesota and Dakota.

Mr. PATERSON.—I think, Mr. Chairman, you have a little interest in maintaining the honor of this committee. I think all the members of the committee have their characters somewhat at stake in this matter. Now, I am pleased to say I have seen Manitoba; I happened to be there in the season of the year Mr. Watson speaks of, and it would gladden the heart of any Canadian to see the crops there. The point I take exception to, is the sentiment that is uttered by the honorable member for North Perth. I say it is not creditable to anyone. His statement here is: you propose to take a year in which frost, as we know, struck our country as well as theirs, and get statements of the United States production for that year, and take a year, without exception, the grandest year we have had of our own, and with the authority of the committee send out to the world, to be criticized by Americans, that comparison. The Americans would say there was a committee sitting there of men, supposed to be intelligent men, seeking for truth, and they are forced, in order to make a favorable comparison with their own country, to take a frost-stricken year, and compare it with a grand year for crops in Canada. This was the sentiment expressed by the honorable member for North Perth, and he says such a comparison is all right. That plan, which is absolutely dishonest, appears to the honorable

member for North Perth to be all right. Mr. Chairman, I believe that a fair comparison will show that our country is superior to Dakota in many respects. I think it escapes the many calamities they are subject to. I think its productiveness will be proved to be more than equal; but for the sake of the honor of the committee, let us not make any such comparison. Let us make proper comparison instead, and let this committee frown down any such dishonesty as comparing an exceptionally good year in Manitoba with an exceptionally bad year in Dakota. I think such a comparison is a piece of short-sighted policy, and the committee will never endorse it.

Mr. HESSON.—I object to the honorable gentleman saying what is not true. I have attempted to put nothing unfair in this respect. The evidence produced before this committee is evidence in which that gentleman went to the districts last year and obtained his information. The evidence he took, I think, was on the crop of 1888, and I think this is proper evidence to prove the advantages of the North-West over Minnesota or Dakota. It was circulated in 1888, although it is the result of 1887. I think that is all right to show the result of 1887. Now he brings before this committee samples of the crop in 1888. We have also the evidence of Mr. Watson, when he got up and made a damaging statement. Then I can take any other year, and it is satisfactory. The average was thirty-one bushels for Manitoba and eleven bushels for Dakota. I say again it was honest and fair. The evidence was useful and proper for him to take. He takes the reports of the United States as to the results of this year. Then there are the results in Manitoba for this year. I venture to say there are many cases where the results were just as good as indicated; I have evidence myself. I don't think Mr. Paterson has any right to get up and lecture me. Mr. Webster would not have been discharging his duty if he had not taken the very best evidence. There are some names on that paper that I am familiar with; I know three or four of them myself. We have to meet this American attempt to belittle our country, and you must do it in every way that is perfectly legitimate and honest. He has a sample taken from that large farming district, Devil's Lake, and he has brought a sample from our own country. He went right across the country, 100 miles north, and got a sample of wheat that could be grown by half of the farmers there. We have to meet this attempt to belittle our country, and I wish we had a dozen such gentlemen as that to go out and do the work.

Mr. PATERSON.—I do not withdraw a word I said. I am not finding fault with the action of the committee, or that a comparison is made with Dakota in 1887 or 1887; but what I take exception to is this—and it is a statement which the honorable gentleman has not hesitated to make in years gone by—that when exception was taken to a comparison of one year with another he should say: "Let it go; it is on our side." That is what I take exception to.

Mr. HESSON.—I say it is fair.

Mr. PATERSON.—When he put an undoubtedly good year in Manitoba against a bad year of theirs, and when it is pointed out by a member that it would not be a fair comparison, he says: "Let us have it anyway; it is in our favor."

Mr. HESSON.—What about Mr. Watson's statement?

Mr. PATERSON.—What Mr. Watson said was fair; but he did not take the Manitoba crop of 1887 and put in against the Dakota crop of 1888. That is what you wanted to do.

Several Hon. MEMBERS.—No, no.

Mr. PATERSON.—Yes; I know I heard the remark. The member for North Perth said: "Let it go; it is in our favor." That is what I take exception to.

Dr. MACDONALD.—I put the question to Mr. Webster, if it is fair to take a good year in Manitoba and compare it with a bad year in Dakota, and Mr. Hesson said: "It is all right; it is on our side."

Mr. HESSON.—I drew attention to the fact that it was dated in June, 1888, and could not represent the crop of 1888.

Dr. MACDONALD.—The real truth is, there has been so much interruption that this mistake occurred in this way: he was simply referring to 1888, and compared the two crops of the same year.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—As a member of this committee, I say that the agent that circulates that circular at the present moment as an inducement for people to go to Manitoba is inducing them to go there under false pretences, and I do not care who says to the contrary. To take two samples of wheat and put them side by side, and say those are fair samples of what can be done in those two countries, is equally misleading. I have no doubt you can find American agents doing just what Mr. Webster is doing—getting samples of frozen wheat in Manitoba and setting them side by side with their good wheat, and say there is one and there is the other. I say, in common fairness to our own people, that setting up a comparison with a crop of a year past is unfair. I do not care under what circumstances these things transpire, I say the truth ought to be known, and I do say that I have no hesitation in saying that if, after Mr. Webster went on and made a statement such as I listened to, with reference to a statement freely made, that a man had to become an American citizen and live five years before he could take out a patent, and so modify it as he did afterwards—if we endorse a statement of that kind and present it to the public in our report as a correct statement, I have no hesitation in saying that you are misleading the public. I suppose it will be thought I am unpatriotic. I say it is a fraud on this committee, and the sooner we realize the truth in these matters it will be better for us; and I do say that Mr. Hesson, the member for Perth, knew this statement was exaggerated. Now, I do think it would be better for us to do so. The difficulty is, that when you ask him for fact, it is patent to everyone you don't get it. Take, for instance, the question with reference to St. Thomas; it was simply what somebody told him in Winnipeg. We all know that this kind of thing is not evidence. We want him to tell us what he saw himself, and what he knows.

Mr. HESSON.—Give him a chance.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think the best time to make this statement is now, because reference was made to it formerly, and it has been referred to again. The member for Huron, Mr. MacMillan, made a statement that it was not necessary to become a citizen of the United States to enable a man to take up land there. Mr. Bain has also referred to that. Now, I hold in my hand here—I don't pretend to vouch for its accuracy—a book called "The Guide Book," published under the authority of the Government of Canada, and I find what purports to be a *fac-simile* of the declaration required to be made by any person taking up land in the United States. It is this:—

DECLARATORY STATEMENT OF A UNITED STATES' CITIZEN.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, }
State of Minnesota. }

DISTRICT COURT,
County of.....

.....
personally appeared before the subscriber, the Clerk of the District Court of the Judicial District for said State of Minnesota, being a Court of Record, and made oath that he was born in on and about the year 18 : that he emigrated to the United States, and landed at the port of on or about the month of in year 18 ; that it is *bona fide* his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce for ever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatever, and particularly to the Queen of England, whereof he is a subject.

Mr. BAIN.—Add that if you choose, but do not make the other statement.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Would a person making that declaration cease to be a Canadian citizen if he went there?

The CHAIRMAN.—I am not prepared to make a statement.

Dr. MACDONALD.—He is not renouncing the Queen. He gives his intention of doing a certain thing at a future time; that future time has not arrived. Supposing he took the oath of allegiance in the United States, do you suppose he could not come back and resume citizenship without taking the oath of allegiance here again?

Mr. DAVIN.—The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in the law. The declaration has to be made when the entry has been made, and sets forth that they intend to become citizens, but the final proof of homestead is the solemn affirmation that they have become citizens of the United States.

Dr. WILSON.—That was not the question that was raised in the first place. The statement was, that a man could not make an entry in the United States unless he was an American citizen.

Dr. FERGUSON (Leeds).—Without that he could not get a title.

Dr. WILSON.—Turn up the notes and you will see that he said, that if he entered at twenty-one he would have to wait until he was twenty-six before he could get a title. It is when he takes out his title he becomes a citizen, and not before.

Mr. GORDON.—Having lived in the United States and noticed the operations of their laws, I may be permitted to make this statement regarding American citizenship. My observation was this, that a British subject, or in fact, any person, must first make the declaration that has been read, and in which he announces his allegiance. He then gets out what is called his first papers. He then has three years to complete his final papers of citizenship, and during that time he cannot get a title to his land until those papers are in his possession. That has been my observation and experience, and I went through the mill. I had a number of friends who had to comply with all those usages in force in that country.

Mr. BAIN.—Do I understand Mr. Gordon to make the assertion that nobody holds land in the United States but American citizens?

Mr. GORDON.—Not by pre-emption or homestead. You can purchase from one who has already held it, but to get a homestead you must become an American citizen.

Mr. MCNEILL.—I have been accused of doing something dishonest in circulating this paper. Here is what this paper says:—"The following is a list of farmers in Manitoba, with their post office addresses and former residence, also the number of acres each had under grain, and the gross yield in each case in the year 1887." This is dated 26th June, 1888. Does anyone dispute the fairness of circulating such a statement of the yield of 1887? Would it be unfair for me to state on any platform in Canada that the yield was so much in Manitoba in 1887? It is true that last year was a year of frost in Manitoba and in parts of the North-West, but is a person to be accused of doing what is dishonest and unfair because he states what the crop was in 1887? The thing is monstrous. I cannot imagine that prejudice would lead to that. I am not talking of frozen wheat. This was the question, and on this I was accused of acting improperly. I am talking about this document. That is all I was referring to before, and that is all I am referring to now.

Mr. BAIN.—Here is the sample of wheat. It is as plain as the nose on your face.

Mr. MCNEIL.—How could prejudice go further, than to say that the circulation of this statement is unfair. I was accused of dishonesty because I said it was a fair thing to state what the crop was in 1887.

Mr. MACDONALD.—This first arose to a question I put, and I want that understood. Mr. Webster was talking about the average production of wheat in 1888. He read from a paper, stating that the average was about ten bushels to the acre in Dakota, and he said: "As an offset, I have gotten up this document. I have selected these farms, and I find that the average in Manitoba was thirty-five to thirty-six bushels per acre." If he wished to offset that with respect to Dakota, by stating

what the crop was in Manitoba in 1887, then it was not an honest offset. When we were condemning the American agents for misrepresenting Manitoba and lauding their own country to the skies we should condemn the same thing here, and not follow suit ourselves. When that was pointed out Mr. Hesson said: "Never mind; it is all in favor of our own country." Certainly it was in favor of our own country; but when this document gets into the hands of American agents they will point out to parties going into the West that we had to resort to this means, and that the facts in our own country could not bear out our statement.

MR. HESSON.—The very best evidence given to this committee is from the gentleman who represents that constituency. We must not overlook it, for in 1887 the results in Manitoba were thirty-one bushels to the acre as against ten bushels

DR. MACDONALD.—I am of the opinion still that Manitoba is a better country than Dakota, and if we had the proper results for 1888 it would be in favor of Manitoba; and then the American agents, when it went before them, could not point out this discrepancy, and say that it compares a poor year in Dakota with a good year in favor of Manitoba. That would be a strong argument.

MR. WEBSTER.—There has been a matter overlooked in connection with that circular, and it is this: Immediately after the crop reports were in, in the fall of 1887, we could then get this information on which to base this circular. I got this information and sent it to the Department, suggesting that it should be printed in a form like this, and it was early spring before it came out. It was as soon as I could get the crop of 1887 before the people, and about July I commenced. It was last July that I commenced to get these circulars. This was the last crop. Outside of that crop entirely, outside of these papers entirely, here is a sample of wheat that I myself got at Morden. I knew the man. He came from North Ontario—Mr. Thompson, who lived in the township of Scott. I went out to his farm and saw this wheat myself at his place, and he loaded up what he told me was a \$100 worth of wheat on a two-horse waggon, and drove it down to Morden. He got \$1.15 a bushel for it. I visited hundreds of farms growing just a sample of wheat the same as that. If that is not fair, I don't know how to do anything fair. There was nothing misleading in that. I got it out immediately after the crop returns were in.

By Mr. WATSON:—

Q.—You visited thousands of farms in Manitoba where the crop seemed as great as that. A.—Yes, sir; this last year in—1888.

Q.—I say you didn't do it? A.—I am perfectly willing to put our words together.

Q.—I don't want to sit here and listen to statements that are not true, and unfortunately a great portion of the members of this committee know these statements are not true. I say we do not wish to discuss the crop of 1888 in Manitoba, owing to the unfortunate frost which struck us in Manitoba, the same as it did in the western States; I say our natural resources are better. I can say so; and I do say so. This circular is to represent the average crop of 1887 as thirty-three bushels to the acre. That is a little over the mark. I say, state the facts as you find them, and compare Manitoba and Dakota, and Manitoba will come out ahead every year. All you want to do is to state the facts. I was sitting on the Immigration Committee in 1883 when the member for North Perth objected because I took exception to a statement by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, when he said 13,000 immigrants moved into Manitoba. I denied the statement. I knew it was not true; and the figures shown since proved it was not true. The member for North Perth got up and said: "For God's sake, if we get a good report, let us have it." We are here for the purpose of finding out the facts in connection with our Canadian North-West, and any portion of the Dominion, and make that information public. If there is anything wrong that we can remedy we are here for the purpose of suggesting a remedy. Why do we establish experimental farms? and Professor Saunders being employed by the Government?

For the simple purpose of trying to show the people of Canada what may be done by improvement. He is here for that purpose. I say the object of this committee is good; but I say, to make statements as speculators and as boomsters with regard to the two countries, and bring two samples, one from Dakota, in a poor year, and the other from Manitoba, in a good year, is absurd. You can find samples of wheat as bad in Manitoba as from Dakota. It is unfortunate, as a gentleman states here, that there is a poor sample from Dakota in a bad year and a good sample from Manitoba. We have as poor samples of wheat in Manitoba this year as any former year, and the average crop of other years were ahead of Dakota. Unfortunately, this year it is well known. Take the crop of 1887, and we had over 12,000,000 of bushels to export; but we have got this year 5,000,000 of bushels to export. We do not want to take this year; we say this year is not a fair average. I say 1887 is not a fair average. This gentleman comes here to occupy the time and attention of this committee, and I say it is worth nothing. I would like to ask this gentleman a question, as mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture. I did dispute some of his statements—his statement that you could buy agricultural implements as cheap and cheaper in Manitoba than you could in Dakota. I would like to ask him for some information, as it was mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture.

Dr. SPROULE.—There is the question of fact—the question of veracity between the two men. Mr. Webster makes a statement and the other flatly contradicts it. I think the deliberate statement that a man is stating what he knows to be a fact is entitled to some other explanation from the gentleman whose veracity is impugned.

Mr. WATSON.—I will answer that to the satisfaction of anyone who knows the crop of Manitoba this year.

Mr. PATERSON.—Mr. Webster gave that as the result of thousands of farms that he saw.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not believe there are two dozen farmers in Manitoba to-day who have as good a sample of wheat as that. I will tell you about the averages in the best sections in Manitoba this year.

The CHAIRMAN.—We must conduct these proceedings with a little more decorum.

Dr. WILSON.—You allowed the witness to insult the member asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN.—I hope I have not allowed anything of that kind to be done. What I would say is this: we are all animated by the same object. We want to present a fair exposition of the advantages Canada possesses. We have a man here, who alleges he has, from his own personal observation, discovered that the advantages of Manitoba and the North-West are much greater than those of Dakota. He brings the evidence before the committee, and unless there is some way of discrediting his evidence otherwise than by mere contradiction—although I do not say that the statements of members of this committee should not be taken—his testimony is entitled to weight. As far as I understand Mr. Webster's statement, in making this comparison he makes it for the year 1888, without reference to this hand-bill. He alleges that in certain districts of Dakota—I do not think he pretended to say that in the whole State of Dakota this condition of things existed, but particularly about Devil's Lake—that the crop was totally destroyed, and notably so in the township to which he refers. I asked him the question pointedly as to whether any townships in Manitoba had been similarly affected, and he said from his observation they had not. That is the best testimony we can get as to the advantages of Manitoba over Dakota. I agree with the gentlemen who hold that we should not allow any exaggerated statements of the advantages of our own country to go abroad, as I think the advantages are such that exaggeration is not necessary.

Mr. PATERSON.—I think this gentleman said there are thousands of farms that yielded crops like that. That statement is doubted by members of the committee, and I think you ought to ask him to give an explanation.

The WITNESS.—The section of country that I referred to is between Morris, following up the north side of Tobacco Creek to Miami, then about forty miles following the range in the Pembina, out through Nelson and Morden, on following east, keeping, say, about ten miles north of the boundary, down through Gretna and the Mennonite Settlement, until you strike the river again. There is a region of about forty miles square, in which for all practical purposes there was no frost. You can take the map and see the number of farms that are embraced in that country, and you can count them up for yourself. I did not keep a tally of every farm. I can assure you there is a large flourishing district of farms, and on that I based this statement. At very many of those farms I stopped over night and saw the threshing done, and saw the wheat, and this is a sample of wheat from the farm of a man named Thompson, who is an ex-Reeve of the township of Scott, in the County of Ontario.

By Dr. WILSON:—

Q.—Is this place directly north of the place in Dakota where you took the wheat? A.—No; a little east. Although only a witness, I will not allow words to be put into my mouth. I said it was north, and a little east. I am as familiar with the country as the township I was born in, and I am speaking of a country that some person here must be familiar with.

By Mr. PATERSON (Brant):—

Q.—How near did it go to Deloraine? A.—Deloraine is 100 miles further west.

Q.—You did not go within 100 miles of Deloraine? A.—No.

By Dr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—Has there not been a good deal of frost in the municipality of Louise? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that not the territory you are speaking of? A.—No, sir; that is higher up on the first terrace of the Souris. Here is a map—a provincial map—only two years old.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I may be permitted to say a few words about this question. I happen to have a farm in that region, in the neighborhood of 400 acres of wheat last season. Now, to tell me that this is a fair average sample of the wheat grown in that section is entirely false? A.—I didn't make any such statement.

Q.—What is the statement? A.—The statement I made was that I got it at Thompson's.

Q.—You said thousands of farmers had equally good samples. They are not in my district. I happen to have a farm in that section.

Mr. GUILLET—Produce your sample.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I have a sample at home, and if you are anxious to have it I will send for it. I think I am able to judge wheat as to sample, and I don't think there is a gentleman in this committee who will doubt what I say. I have been an owner of a mill for a good many years, and I have grown wheat for a good many years. In order to satisfy you I will send for a sample. I haven't seen many samples like that. I have seen samples from a great many other sections, and from the elevators, and there is no such sample of wheat as that in the market. I don't doubt he might have picked it up in one or two places.

By Dr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—Was there any frozen wheat in that district? A.—Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Tell us what you did say in reference to that; it is important that your evidence should be properly taken down.

Mr. DALY.—Will you say any frozen wheat was shipped from Gretna, Morden or Plum Coolie this year? The very neighborhood you are describing, there wasn't a bit of frost through the whole of it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I can say there was frost. There certainly was. I have had farmers tell me themselves.

By the CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Kindly state what you wish to convey to the committee. A.—Well, Mr. Chairman, it is simply a repetition. There is that country forty miles square where I got this sample of wheat. I got many samples in addition to this that were quite similar. I had some friends living about Miami, living within two or three miles of it, where I got this sample. Then I went north out near the boundary through Morden, so as to take in that square forty miles. Inside of that forty miles, and I state it here as a matter of fact, that I saw but one piece of wheat left uncut, and that was above Carman, on the banks of Tobacco Creek. And I went to the man; we met him at Carman and drove back to examine the wheat, and found it was fine, but it had been injured. I asked him why he did not cut it, and he said: "I have about 6,000 bushels of wheat, and instead of cutting that, I am going to turn in a herd of sheep. I think I will make as much out of it." There was the only spot of frozen wheat I saw. I am speaking now in a general way. That was the only piece of frozen wheat I saw left uncut, which had been frosted in that forty miles of country, and I make that statement, knowing well the statement I am making.

Mr. HESSON.—About implements?

Mr. COCHRANE.—Yes; the statement was made by the hon. member from Marquette last night, that a statement had been made by Mr. Webster that agricultural implements were as cheap in Manitoba as in Dakota. I want Mr. Webster to make a statement, so far as he knows, about the prices.

Mr. WEBSTER.—I will be very glad to tell what I know, and the pains I took to ascertain about the relative price of agricultural implements in both countries, I had heard and read about for five years, and I made up my mind it was worth investigating. At Grand Forks I appeared as a farmer, in a farmer's dress; and when I went there I went into the agency of the implement works to buy implements. I went in to purchase implements, and went there about the season of the year when the farmers would be likely to purchase, and I have the lowest cash prices. For a binder similar to the Toronto steel binder, as far as I was competent to judge, the two implements compared very favorably in regard to the quantity, and so on. I did that in other implement shops—in every implement shop in Fargo, and in every town in which I was in where they had an agricultural implement agency, and I went over into Manitoba to examine them there—in the first place in Morden, and in the second place in Bossivine. I found I could buy just as cheap in Bossivine, 100 miles from Winnipeg—just as cheap as in Grand Forks.

By Mr. WATSON:—

Q.—What are the prices? A.—\$170 for a binder.

Q.—What is the price of the waggon? A.—I didn't inquire particularly into waggons. It was implements, mowers and binders.

Q.—What is a mower worth? A.—About \$70.

Q.—Seeders? A.—\$70.

Q.—Ploughs? A.—I have forgotten ploughs.

Q.—That is an important thing? A.—I did look as to the price of ploughs out there, but I cannot say from memory.

The WITNESS.—When I talked to persons in Manitoba about the prices they laughed at the thing. They said: "it is all bosh that prices are cheaper in Dakota." Agent after agent told me in Manitoba that they were selling them just as cheap. I had the *Globe*, which took back all it had said for years, and said that

implements were about as cheap and the land laws were much more liberal, and coarse clothing very much cheaper than in Dakota. I have carried that around and exhibited it at my lectures until it was worn out.

Mr. WATSON.—I made that statement. I have ascertained the price of machinery in Watertown, Dakota, and in Portage la Prairie, Manitoba. Portage la Prairie is the town I live in, and I know the prices of implements there. I will produce a witness who buys and sells these implements in Watertown, Dakota, who will substantiate the figures I am about to give you. In Manitoba the cash price of a binder is \$180. That is the cash price of a steel binder, 7-foot cut, and Mr. Daly will admit that is a low enough price for a 7-foot cut. I have taken the lowest possible prices you can buy these articles at in Manitoba, and the price of that same binder in Watertown, Dakota, is \$110, with a bundle-carrier attached. Those in Manitoba are of Canadian manufacture, but there is no one but will admit that the American is a little superior to the Canadian. In waggons, in Manitoba the price is \$85. That is the ordinary waggon, with double box. In Watertown, Dakota, the price is \$55. A seeder in Manitoba is \$70; in Watertown, \$48. A walking plough in Manitoba is \$22, and in Dakota \$18. The sulky-plough in Manitoba (that is the double-furrow 16-inch plough) is \$70, and in Watertown it is \$48. The mower which this gentleman has spoken of as selling at \$70, in Watertown, Dakota, sells at \$55. Those are the prices of these machines as they can be purchased for cash.

The WITNESS.—I am quoting the prices two years ago.

Mr. WATSON.—Those are the figures for 1887. Last year, as the Trade and Navigation Returns show, we imported into Manitoba something over \$25,000 worth of ploughs. There is 35 per cent. duty, and we have to pay the duty every time. I will say this, that the duty on binders, waggons, seeders and mowers has practically shut out the American implements; but as far as ploughs are concerned, the Manitoba farmer will have the American plough even yet. He considers it is cheaper even at \$2 or \$3 more per plough.

Hon. Mr. CARLING.—What is the duty on binders?

Mr. WATSON.—35 per cent., and they are valued at \$130, where the actual cost to the man who ships them into Manitoba is \$75 or \$80; but the Government insist on putting a value of \$130 on, and the consequence is that the duty on that sum has to be paid.

Hon. Mr. CARLING.—Did you say the duty has shut those implements out? That would not shut them out.

Mr. WATSON.—If the honorable gentleman will figure out the duty on \$130 he will see that it would shut them out.

Mr. McDOWALL.—If it is shipped from the United States it could be billed at \$90.

Mr. WATSON.—The duty on binders into Manitoba has got to be paid at \$130. That is one of the greatest grievances we have with the Customs regulations.

The CHAIRMAN.—That would only be \$155.50.

Hon. Mr. CARLING.—I understood the honorable gentleman to say the duty on American implements had entirely shut them out.

Mr. WATSON.—I say that is so, with the exception of ploughs and steam threshing machines. There is a considerable number of J. I. Case separators and steam threshing machines brought into Manitoba.

Mr. PERLEY.—I understood the honorable member from Marquette to say that these machines cost \$110 and that the duty was 35 per cent. That would make \$38.50 duty, which would make the implement cost—

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Watson says the duty on \$130, making the total cost \$155.50.

Mr. PERLEY.—He said the price of this machine in Manitoba was \$180. Now, it does not seem reasonable to me that that can be the case. I do not know what it might be—and I would not question the statement of an honorable member—but it seems to me that there must be some mistake about that. It does not look reasonable that these implements of American manufacture are put up to such a high price that they could not come into this country.

Mr. GUILLET.—Mr. Watson pointed out that these implements were bought at about \$70 apiece, and they were imported from the United States; so they cost about \$70, and sold retail at \$110. If you had the duty upon \$130 you have an implement costing about \$110. What is to prevent them being imported into Manitoba?

Mr. WATSON.—I have ascertained the facts as to what we can purchase these machines for in the two different countries, and I say that to my own knowledge—and I think Mr. Daly will bear me out with the figures I have given, as far as the prices of the Manitoba machinery are concerned are correct, and I can prove by a reliable witness that the price in Watertown, Dakota, is correct.

Mr. DALY.—The figures of the hon. member for Marquette, as to the binder are correct as far as 1887; \$180 was the cash price for the Massey and the Harris & Co. steel binder made from American patterns, but I think the hon. gentleman is considerably astray when he says you can sell an American binder in Manitoba for \$155. The fact of the matter is, about five years ago these same binders, these American binders, were selling for \$315 and \$320 on time, and the effect of this 35 per cent. duty has been to encourage the production of Canadian binders. It is not the price of the American binder that our farmers look to; they say it is a superior article, and they would rather use it, and the duty has not shut it out of Manitoba. A man can buy an American binder cheaper to-day than he could before the 35 per cent. duty was put on. To compete, the manufacturers of American binders have to sell at half the cost that Canadians do, and the effect is that the American binder to our farmers is very much reduced in price.

Mr. WEBSTER.—With regard to the price of these binders, Massey's agent told me on the day I left Morden in Manitoba and the North-West. I said I want your selling cash price for this year, so that I can tell the farmers that I meet this winter in regard to the prices of implements, and he said \$165 this year is the cash price of our steel binders.

By Mr. WATSON:—

Q.—What cut? A.—I am not prepared to say. I think they are all 7-foot cut. I doubt if they are using anything else.

Mr. WATSON.—They are selling a 5-foot 7 in. cut for a pair of horses.

By Mr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—Did you make inquiries as to what cut it was? A.—I saw it myself; I didn't ask.

Q.—Was it a 5-foot or a 7-foot cut? A.—It was a 7-foot cut.

Mr. DALY.—There is no doubt about it; it is a 7-foot cut. They were selling an inferior article four or five years ago at \$315 on credit, and you can buy the same binder to-day at \$190 credit, and the present article is said to be a superior article. The increased protection has reduced the price year by year.

By Mr. PATERSON:—

Q.—That territory of forty miles square that you went through, was it pretty well settled? A.—I was exhibiting a map here that shows the settlement. There was a portion very well settled in the northern part and central part. There is settlement from Morris to Pomeroy, but not thickly settled.

Q.—Would it be half settled? A.—There is three-quarters of it pretty well settled.

Q.—Because I think it gives over a million acres, and if three-quarters of it were settled, and producing thirty-five bushels to the acre, it would give more than the whole crop of the Province. A.—I see you are not a farmer, all right.

Q.—What is the crop? A.—Manitoba issues a crop bulletin.

Q.—But you have said what it was in this district? A.—I could not keep a record of each ten acres and fifty acres of wheat. That is a job that would require an assessor to do.

Q.—You visited this district? A.—Yes; and walked over it.

Q.—What would be your idea of the amount under wheat in that forty miles square? A.—A very small proportion of it under wheat.

Q.—But three-quarters of it was occupied. What was the balance of it? A.—Just prairie.

By Dr. MACDONALD:—

Q.—How long since that section of the country has been settled? A.—Nine years.

Mr. DALY.—That is where the Mennonites live.

Q.—Do you mean to tell me there is an average of only ten bushels to the acre on the Mennonite settlement? A.—I never said anything of the kind.

Q.—You said only a small proportion of the territory was under wheat, and we know it has been settled for a number of years along the districts you have stated; and if there is only an average of ten acres of each 160 under crop, certainly the progress of the country has been very slow? A.—I never made any such statement.

By Mr. PATERSON:—

Q.—About what proportion would be under wheat? A.—I answered before, that it would be impossible to give a statement accurate at all.

Q.—You ought to be able to say something. I want to know the progress the farmers are making there; I want to know what percentage of a farm, on the average, according to his observation, extending over months in the district he has mentioned, was under wheat in 1888. What proportion of each 160 acres was left prairie, and what proportion under wheat? A.—I think I can answer that, because it seems to be the rule there with farmers—and even those who have been only a few years in the country—to try and grow about eighty acres of wheat each year.

Q.—On 160 acres? A.—No; on a half section.

Q.—That is quarter of a half section? A.—Yes; about eighty acres. In fact, they try to put forth efforts to grow 100. That is just young men, that calculate as the result of their labor to grow about eighty acres of wheat in addition to other crops.

Q.—With the other 240 acres, what proportion of that was under grain? A.—That I cannot tell, because it was only the wheat I was looking after.

Q.—You spent months there for the purpose of ascertaining these points. A.—They are all in the habit of growing more or less oats.

Q.—I want it in acres? A.—I could not put it in acres.

Q.—I am only asking for an approximate idea of what was under wheat, and what proportion was meadow? A.—Mr. Chairman, from the best of my knowledge, based on the result of some farms that I visited and walked over—walked over with the farmers, around their wheat fields, and seeing their oats growing, for that is what I based it on—that on an average they would calculate to grow all the oats they required for feeding, which I think would be 400 or 500 bushels. They would endeavor to have ten acres of oats.

Q.—Wheat 80 and oats 10. Barley how much? A.—There is not much barley grown there. This I found there, that the district that grew barley grew little or no wheat. There are some small portions of the country about Gretna that are said to be good for barley.

Q.—Give me just your idea of how many acres? A.—In regard to barley, I only found a few growing it in one or two sections, and those were growing little or no wheat.

Q.—How many acres? A.—I could not tell; I made no attempt at all to estimate the quantities.

Q.—What do you think? A.—I could not say.

Q.—But you must say. The Chairman has ruled my question in order. I maintain that the questions are pertinent.

Dr. FERGUSON (Leeds).—I consider them decidedly impertinent.

Mr. PATERSON.—Peas and other grains? A.—There is little or no peas grown there.

Q.—Very little barley, very little peas, and other grains not enumerated—wheat, oats, barley, peas—very little? A.—There is a year in which there is some flax.

Q.—How much flax? A.—I could not say.

Q.—Very little? A.—I think the last two or three years they have gone out of the flax. There was a time when they grew quite an amount of flax.

Q.—The root crop—is there much of that? A.—I think they all grow their own potatoes.

Q.—Very little roots. How much hay land would there be? Is it a pasturage country? A.—All that part of the country not under crop is growing the very best grass.

Q.—How many acres do you think in that section would be under meadow? A.—That which wasn't ploughed.

Q.—It would be all grass? A.—Yes.

Q.—How was it used? A.—Burned by prairie fires—that is, the grass of those who have not got stock.

Q.—This is not grown for use? A.—It is a native grass.

Q.—Then I understand it, with the exception of what the farmer keeps for himself, it is hay land lying idle? A.—Yes.

Q.—Then I have ninety acres, very little barley, very little peas, very little flax, very little potatoes or roots of any kind—so when you put an average for all that, there is very little more than about another ten acres. That is 100 acres of the 320 is crop, taking in his hay and everything else, and the rest of land is lying idle in this district of forty miles square. Is that a fair summary, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes; that is a fair summary.

Mr. PATERSON.—Well, we will let the farmers judge with this land under cultivation.

By Mr. McNEIL:—

Q.—You made a statement with regard to the amount of wheat that is grown. You spoke of eighty acres of wheat. Did you mean, when you stated that, that you considered that there was an average of eighty acres of wheat on each of these holdings in the North-West? A.—Not at all; nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON.—Certainly, if you refer to the shorthand report, I think you will find that is what he said.

Mr. McNEIL.—If you will refer to the shorthand notes you will find the witness said they aimed at having eighty acres; and you will find, before these questions were put to him, that he most distinctly stated that he could not give an average at all, as it was out of his power.

Mr. PATERSON.—I rose and asked this gentleman if he would give us his approximation of what was grown on 160 acres, and he said eighty acres of wheat.

Mr. McNEIL.—No; he said they aimed at growing eighty acres.

Mr. PATERSON.—That is half a section, and my whole question was: I asked him for the particulars of this 320 acres. The chairman has just said it was a fair statement, and I think the members of the committee are with the chairman as a unit that it is a fair statement. The statement, as taken down in shorthand notes, will show it.

Dr. FERGUSON.—The witness has either been misunderstood by the committee or Mr. Paterson, or by the chairman. If the witness has not been fairly understood, as reported by Mr. Paterson, I think the witness ought now to correct that statement, or say that he was fairly understood. I did not understand the witness to say that that was an average over the whole settlement of forty miles square, or even that that was a fair approximation of the success attained by the better part of the successful farmers there. He said many of them aimed at doing that?

A.—That is what I said.

Dr. FERGUSON.—That should be corrected in the notes, because it is a misapprehension or misconstruction of the witness' statement.

Mr. PATERSON.—I submit that the honorable gentleman has no right to say misconstruction.

Dr. FERGUSON.—I say so, and I appeal to the witness now.

Mr. PATERSON.—If I understood what the shorthand reporter has taken down, if he understood it in the same way as it is reported there, would it be misconstruction?

Dr. FERGUSON.—If the clerk has reported it as you have stated, I say you have both misunderstood. My ears are just as good as either the reporter or yourself.

Mr. PATERSON.—I think we better have these notes read. I move that these notes be read, dating back to the commencement.

Dr. SPROULE.—The first statement made by Mr. Paterson was: Do you think there was ten acres; and he said, far more. He said he didn't travel all through the country in view to the finding out the approximate assessment of wheat. He didn't pretend to say that this was an average, but he was led step by step to say that the farmers aimed at it; some of them went over it and some of them went under it. The shorthand notes were then read as follows:—

“By Mr. PATERSON:—

“Q.—About what proportion would be under wheat? A.—I answered before that it would be impossible to give a statement accurate at all.

“Q.—You ought to be able to say something. I want to know what progress the farmers are making there. I want to know what percentage of a farm, on the average, according to his observation, extending over months in the districts he has mentioned, was under wheat in 1888? What proportion of each 160 acres was left prairie and what proportion under wheat? A.—I think I can answer that, because it seems to be the rule there with farmers—and even those who have been only a few years in the country—to try and grow about eighty acres each year.

“Q.—On 160 acres? A.—No; on a half-section.

“Q.—That is a quarter of a half-section? A.—Yes; about eighty acres. In fact, they try to put forth efforts to grow 100. That is just young men, that calculate as the result of their labor to grow about eighty acres of wheat in addition to other crops.

“Q.—With the other 240 acres, what proportion was under grain? A.—That I cannot tell, because it was only the wheat I was looking after.”

Mr. PATERSON.—I think the member for Leeds should withdraw his statement.

Dr. FERGUSON (Leeds).—I have no statement to withdraw. If the evidence, as read, was intended to show that was the average, it is wrong. Let it be stated in the evidence that it is not the average.

Mr. McNEIL.—I wish to have the answer to my question read.

The stenographer here read as follows :—

“Q.—You made a statement with regard to the amount of wheat that is grown. You spoke of eighty acres of wheat. Did you mean, when you stated that, that you considered there was an average of eighty acres of wheat on each of these holdings in the North-West? A.—Not all all; nothing of the kind.”

Mr. PATERSON.—What does this mean when the other note has been printed? You are going to publish this report. He has made the statement that these farmers have eighty acres under wheat and some 100, but he would say the average was eighty. What is the meaning of this last statement that has been read now. What does this gentlemen say now of 320 acres—how much wheat does he think on the average there is?

A.—If I can make it plainer. Here, I published a list—

Q.—I just asked the question; what answer do you mean to give? Do you qualify your first answer to me? A.—This is the first and last answer, that those engaged in farming, whose farms I visited and had an opportunity of seeing, seemed to have a rule to put forth an effort to grow between eighty and 100 acres of wheat as the result of their operations—that is, men who had teams and appliances for carrying on farming.

Q.—On a half section? A.—Whatever the size of the farm was.

Q.—You said a half section? A.—Because that was a man's farm—a half section. They said to me: “When we were down in Ontario we could never grow more than ten or fifteen acres of wheat in our lives, and see what amount we can grow here, on account of the ease with which the land can be tilled.”

By Mr. COCHRANE :—

Q.—You were not speaking of each farm? A.—No; I had reference to the farms I visited. If Mr. Paterson thinks he can lead me up by a series of figures to show that there is 50,000,000 of bushels, he is wrong. I answered the question as I understood it, and that was what each farmer was succeeding in growing, according to the average of his farm. Is that the question?

By Mr. PATERSON :—

Q.—My question was, what from your observation would you estimate the average wheat grown by farmers within that forty square miles to the half section? A.—My answer is this, based on my own practical information for the number of farms I visited; I did not visit every farm in that forty miles square. That would take a long time, but those I visited, meaning those that I drove over and those which I did not, I found in conversing with the farmers and seeing the amount of their wheat stacks that what they aimed to grow was between 80 and 100 acres of wheat, and they compared that with what they were doing in Ontario.

Q.—Do you judge that was a fair average over the whole forty miles? A.—The only means I had of knowing was that they were accomplishing it.

Q.—What was your judgment in your own mind, as the travelling agent of the Dominion Government, gathering information? What was your idea? A.—That was what they were doing.

Q.—You do not think there were many of them doing more? A.—I imagine these men were good, fair, average men.

Q.—According to the figures I have down, Mr. Webster has shown that in this magnificent district the farmers have 100 acres out of 320 that they are utilizing, and the rest is burned over with prairie fires? A.—Remember, in addition to this, that while these go on 100 acres are growing in wheat, there is another 100 acres alongside of it summer fallowing, and the rest is prairie. Every farmer prepares the land this year that he is going to sow next.

Q.—One hundred acres in crop and 100 acres in fallow every well-to-do farmer has on his 320? A.—Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD.—He has the rest for his cattle, and sheep and horses.

By Mr. BAIN :—

Q.—Did they thresh when you were there? A.—About half of them did.

Q.—About what time were you there? A.—Through October and November.

Q.—What time were you in Dakota? The same time? A.—Yes.

Q.—That would be in October? A.—It was in October I was in Dakota.

By Mr. TROW :—

Q.—I would ask the witness what portion of Manitoba he has been describing. Does it start at Morris and end at Pomeroy? A.—No; I started at Morris and struck west until I got into the range of Tobacco Creek and followed that to Miami and out to Nelson, Nelson out to Morden, from Morden east, keeping eight or ten miles from the boundary to Gretna, and from Gretna down to the Red River.

Q.—You have not been describing the Boyne settlement at all? A.—It would come within the same range.

Q.—Are you aware there is a very large swamp there? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any idea of the area of that? A.—I have not the figures. I know it is quite a large swamp—hay land.

Q.—You do not calculate they raise wheat there on that land? A.—It is hay land; farmers all go there to get their hay.

Q.—There is a very large proportion of that forty miles square that is calculated for settlement further than for grass? A.—For grass.

Q.—There is 150,000 acres there that you could not pretend to raise wheat on? A.—That is what they call the Boyne Sink. I used to own land there myself.

Q.—You do not pretend to say wheat was grown there to the extent of eighty acres in the Boyne settlement? A.—I think I am about accurate in the statement.

Q.—Your description of the oat crop seems to me to be a good deal below what really is the case, because they have the large oat crop in the Boyne settlement? A.—In any one of the settlements I was speaking about I think they were growing about what would be required for feeding; that would be about 500 bushels for an average crop.

Mr. COCHRANE.—I would like to ask the witness a question from his own observation. I understand him to say he has travelled in Dakota, Minnesota and the North-West, and met many friends who had lived in this section of the country who had settled in the North-West, Minnesota and Dakota. How do they compare one with the other—in what section of the country have the farmers done the best, those who have gone to Manitoba or Minnesota? A.—Of those of whom I knew before they went there, and whom I have visited, I am glad to be in a position to answer that, satisfactorily to myself, at least. I found that those in our own country had made far more progress and were surrounded by more comforts and possessed a good deal more wealth, as far as my observation went, than those in Dakota. I make this statement, having taken a great deal of pains to arrive at the fact.

By Mr. TROW :—

Q.—Is it their own fault or the fault of the land—is the land not as productive? A.—No, sir; the land is not as productive, with the exception of Coos County, Grand Forks and Chevalier county, and a couple of others. They are not to be compared with the lands in Manitoba any more than the deserts of Arabia.

Q.—These are equal to any portion of ours? A.—It is the same Red River land.

Q.—They are better? No; I don't think they are better.

Q.—You are a little prejudiced? A.—No; I am not. I only said it was very similar to our own Red River valley.

Mr. WATSON.—There is one statement with regard to summer-fallow that is misleading. Mr. Webster stated that about one-half is under cultivation as summer-

fallow each year. That would give a person to understand that this was done from the commencement of the cultivation of the land. The land is not summer-fallowed until some four or five crops are taken off, as a rule. I don't think there is one-third under summer-fallow each year.

WITNESS.—Mr. Chairman, the words I dropped about summer-fallow might be misleading to the Ontario farmer. They have 100 acres off at a time for the purpose of ploughing through the summer.

By Mr. WATSON.—How many years has this land been under crop before they started to summer-fallow? A.—It has been under crop for a number of years.

By Mr. PATERSON:—

Q.—It does not mean that this ploughing is being done in order to get ready to begin on the next year? A.—It has been left there for the purpose of being ploughed during the summer.

By Mr. HESSON:—

Q.—It has been broken up? A.—Yes; it takes most of the summer to plough the 100 acres.

Mr. PATERSON.—He explains that there is 100 acres under crop and 100 acres under summer-fallow. It is left there ready to plough.

Mr. WATSON.—The land is ploughed, but it is not supposed there is the same labor over a summer-fallow as there is in eastern Canada. The land gets about one ploughing, and one ploughing, from experience, is better than two or three; and the farmer up there ploughs his land, not particularly for the reason that the land is running out, but for the purpose of employing his labor during the summer months. If he has a farm of 300 acres, he can summer-fallow 100 acres and he has only got 100 acres to plough in the fall each year, and he has 200 acres ready for the spring. He keeps about one-third under summer-fallow, and he is able to employ his teams during the summer months and prepare his lands for next year's crop. I thought from the statement made by Mr. Webster that it might be understood it was necessary to summer-fallow land from the commencement.

Mr. WEBSTER.—That word might mislead.

Mr. DALY.—They allow the weeds to reach a certain stage, and they put a chain on front of their plough and plough them under, and the weeds are good manure.

The committee then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 17th April, 1887.

MOVEMENT OF CANADIANS TO THE UNITED STATES.

The Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met this morning, Mr. White (Renfrew), presiding.

MR. JOHN LOWE, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, called and examined.

By The CHAIRMAN:—

Q.—Mr. Lowe, will you kindly state to the committee the matter you have to bring before us? A.—The figures which I propose to lay before the committee may be stated as the complement of those which I have previously given. They have relation to the movement of Canadians to the United States. The facts are certainly of very great interest and importance. I will endeavor to state them as clearly as I can, and I may say that the authority on which I shall base all the statements I shall make relating to this movement of Canadians is the census of the United States.

By Mr. Trow :—

Q.—When were they taken? A.—It is the last census of 1880. I will endeavor to make the statement as concise as possible. In the first place, there comes the question of numbers. The numbers of Canadians who have gone to the United States are very considerable, and they form a considerable percentage of our whole population. Perhaps, before I begin, I may make this explanation: I may say that if there are any errors in the United States census they are not errors of minimization. I will not say they are errors of exaggeration of the men who have performed the gigantic work of compiling this volume (holding up the census). There is this point, however, to be considered: The United States paid their enumerators so much per head. That is a fact which offers a considerable temptation to exaggeration. I do not say that it has taken place; I only present the fact to the committee. In relation to our own census, we do not pay by the tale of heads, but give so much to the enumerator for what we call learning his lesson—learning how to make his enumeration uniform and intelligent. Then we have an allowance for miles travelled, and allowance for the families, but the allowance for the families is not such as to make it a temptation to exaggeration. It was thought by Dr. Taché, who framed these rules, that paying enumerators by the tale of heads was a temptation to which the Department should not expose its census enumerators. The first record we have in the United States census is of that the year 1850, when there were 147,711 British American “nativities” enumerated in the United States—that is, persons born in British America. In 1860 that number had swollen to 249,970, being an increase over the previous number of 68·66 per cent. In 1870 that number had swollen to 476,572, making the enormous percentage of increase over the previous number of 90·65 per cent. The next figure is that of 1880, when it was found that 710,585 British American nativities were found in the United States. That was an increase over the previous decenniad of 49·10 per cent. It therefore follows that the period of greatest intensity of Canadian emigration was between the years 1860 and 1870, both numerically and in relation to ratio having in view density of population.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe that ratio has gone on for the last decade? A.—I cannot answer that question with positiveness; and if Mr. Trow will allow me, I will deal simply with the facts, in the first place, as we have them recorded, and possibly the committee may see ground for some inference afterwards.

By Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) :—

Q.—Are not these percentages calculated to be deceptive, because the American population is growing very rapidly? A.—Density is to be considered, but my statement is of numbers enumerated. I will endeavor to point out what I understand to be the reasons for the fact. I think we shall discover, from a study of the figures in this volume, what, in some measure, may be called a law of movement of population. That it is constant, we have many proofs. It follows from the figures which I have given, that what has been called the exodus to the United States is not less than 16·40 per cent. of the population of the Dominion, as found by our census in 1881. It is next of interest to see to what parts of the United States these people have gone, and I have here made an abstract of ten principal States, in which 78 per cent. of the whole of the Canadians enumerated are found, according to this record. The figures are interesting. Michigan contained 21 per cent. of all the Canadians in the United States, and Massachusetts 17. New York contains 12 per cent., Maine 5, Illinois 5, Minnesota 4, Wisconsin 4, New Hampshire 4, Vermont 3 and Iowa 3— in all, 78 per cent. I made recently, and I have here, the details as respects all the States, but it is not worth while for my purpose now to go further. I wish simply to accept the facts which are established by the enumerations.

Mr. Trow.—At what season of the year was the census taken in 1880?

Mr. Lowe.—In the United States?

Mr. Trow.—Yes.

Mr. LOWE.—In June. They took their census in June, 1880, and we took ours in April, 1881. The first year of the decenniad is chosen for the British census year, and it is taken uniformly throughout the British Empire—including the colonies—in that year.

Mr. TROW.—A very large proportion of those who go to Michigan from Canada go in the winter and return in the summer; so, taking the winter, it will have a greater effect.

Mr. LOWE.—I am quite aware of that fact. And it is possible, it may have happened that the form of enumeration of the United States and the manner in which they make their returns would lead to the inclusion of a great many of those nativities who properly, according to their system, ought not to have been entered, because they take their census on what is called the *de jure* or *de droit* system, in the same way that we take ours.

General LAURIE.—It is exactly opposite in Massachusetts. Our people go down in the spring and come back in the autumn.

Mr. LOWE.—The figures I give are simply those taken from the United States census.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—Do they in any way divide the French and English speaking population who go to Massachusetts?

Mr. LOWE.—That division is not made, but in a little analysis which I made of this question in 1883 I attempted to do that as far as possible. It is generally conceded that the emigration to the group of New England States is French Canadian. It is found, however, that Massachusetts absorbs the great bulk of that emigration.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—I see in Massachusetts, since 1885, there is a larger proportion of English-speaking population from the other Provinces than of French. I was a good deal surprised to see it.

Mr. LOWE.—There has been undoubtedly a movement of French Canadian population toward the North-West, but it has not, I think, been very large. I think that possibly the largest part of them may even be found in the State of Michigan, where French Canadian lumbermen may have gone to the woods there; but I think the bulk of the French population has undoubtedly gone to the New England manufacturing States, and that movement was in the greatest intensity between 1860 and 1870. It is known to have been going on for a great many years. We come next to another fact of very great interest, which is found in this volume of the census of the United States, and that is the emigration from all the older States to the newer States. The figures are most striking and, in fact, at first sight even difficult to believe, but I give these figures to the committee with confidence as being based on this census. The State of Maine was found by the United States census of 1880 to have lost of its native-born population alone—that is, the figures do not refer to any movements of immigrants who had come from outside—182,257, or 24 per cent. of the whole. New Hampshire lost 128,505, or 35 per cent. of the whole population; Vermont had lost 178,261, or 41 per cent. of its native population; Massachusetts, which has gained the greater part of our emigration, lost 267,730, or 20 per cent. of its population; Rhode Island lost 49,235, or 24 per cent.; Connecticut 140,621, or 26 per cent. We come next to the great State of New York, and we find from this census record that it had lost 1,197,153 of its native population, being 25 per cent. of the whole. The State of New Jersey lost 180,391, or 20 per cent., while the great State of Pennsylvania lost 798,487, being 19 per cent. of its native population. The mean of all these figures is 25.65 per cent. loss of native population.

Mr. TROW.—Between what dates?

Mr. LOWE.—The facts relate to the record as found by the census of the United States for 1880. I have not the figures between periods, as between 1870 and 1880.

We can only take the figures as enumerated as a whole, and as thus given they afford food for reflection. There is one State, the State of Ohio, which I think probably more naturally compares with Ontario than any State in the Union. That State was found to have lost of its native population in numbers 941,219, or 28 per cent. of the whole. These figures are to me, at least, of the greatest interest. They furnish inferences we can apply. Well, now, I come to another statement of figures, and that is the immigration into the group of central States, which may be called the northern central group, consisting of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska. This statement does not in any way refer to the immigration of any foreign-born, but to the immigration of native-born Americans to this central group of States. The numbers are very large. Illinois obtained a native immigration of 784,775, or 32 per cent. of its whole population; Michigan obtained an immigration of 445,123 of native Americans, equal to 36 per cent. of its population.

By Dr. MACDONALD :—

Q.—Would Mr. Lowe tell us what period of years? A.—The figures are totals, as found by the United States census of 1880. I confine myself to the recorded facts; there are no means of obtaining a separation of these figures into periods.

Q.—Did these 700,000 come to Illinois in the previous history of the State, or during the last ten years? A.—It was the total immigration of native-born Americans into that State from the commencement to the year 1880. Wisconsin got 24 per cent.; the State of Iowa got the large numerical figure of 625,659, or 46 per cent. of its whole population; Missouri got 688,161, or 35 per cent., and Kansas, 74 per cent. of native-born population, or 652,944; Nebraska got 259,288, or 73 per cent. That is a mean or average of no less than 57 per cent. of the total population of all these States.

By Mr. BAIN :—

Q.—I suppose that means the younger the State the larger the percentage? A.—That is undoubtedly the case; but when you take such a State as Illinois, receiving an addition to native population of over three-quarters of a million, and Missouri showing a gain of the same of 688,161, the fact is at least remarkable. We now come to another fact, and that is the distribution of population in the whole of the United States, as shown by the census of 1880. The population of what the United States census compiler denominated the Atlantic plain—that is, the whole face of the continent on the east of the Apalachian range of mountains, is now found to be only 29.84 per cent. of that of the whole United States. That region was, in the early years, and until comparatively recent years—in fact, until years within our own memory, when the movement to the West took place—the seat of population and civilization of the United States, there being very little population west of the mountains. We have next the distribution in the Apalachian region—that is the range which takes its rise in Gaspé and runs down the whole face of the continent, and which is a mineral region of the United States—and this is found to contain 13.38 per cent. of the population of the United States. We next come to the interior valley—that is, the great central valley of the United States, between the two ranges of mountains, with a general north and south trend. There was found in that valley, according to the census of the United States, 53.50 per cent. of all the population of the United States. West of that in what they call the Cordilleran region, which takes in the Pacific slope, and various mining and agricultural industries found in the slopes of those mountains—there is only 3.28 per cent. of the population. The facts show a complete change in the centres of population in the United States within the memory of men now living. I come now to another fact, according to this census volume, and that relates to the British Canadian population in the second generation, in the United States. The compilers of the volume arrived at their results by a very intricate method, which it is very difficult to understand. I therefore make no remark whatever on the method, but simply give the results.

Q.—What is the second generation? Is that children born in the United States whose parents have gone there from British Provinces? A.—Yes. If any member would like to study that point for himself he will find the details in this American census volume, page 679. The results simply come to this, that in the United States in 1880 there were persons having British fathers who numbered 939,247, and those having British-American mothers numbered 931,408, and of British-American nativities in the United States 717,159. I gave the figures 710,000 to the committee, but the figures which are given in these statements include the population of Newfoundland, which I eliminated, to confine my statement to the Dominion.

By Mr. McNEILL :—

Q.—Do I understand that these only had one parent that was British—that is, half-breeds? A.—Their rule seems to be this: they take the mean of the percentage and subtract the nativities from it. The method I find both intricate and curious, and I merely give it as I find it. That really brings a result, according to their tables, of 218,170 in the second generation of citizens of British-American origin; or, taking it by another test, they give this: for every 1,000 in the United States born in British America there were 1,310 who had a British-American father and 1,292 who had a British-American mother. The mean of that rule, which they give in the large text as the principle upon which they have proceeded, would give 215,100 Canadians in the second generation in the United States.

By Dr. ROBERTSON :—

Q.—What do they call them over there? Half-breeds? A.—I am sure I cannot tell you that. They are native Americans, having either one or two British-American parents.

By Mr. McNEILL :—

Q.—They are not of British-American parentage, are they? They are half-British-American? A.—They may be half, and that is the intricacy of their rule. Some have both fathers and mothers British-American; some have fathers British-American and some have only mothers. However this fact may be, the result, according to their statement, shows that number which I have given.

We come now to another class of facts, and that is the relation of the number of Canadian nativities to population in the United States according to the census of 1880. That was 14 per thousand of the whole population. I have tried the same test by our own census returns of 1881, one year later, and I found 18 of United States birth per thousand of the population in Canada. If we apply the same test to the census of the Province of Ontario as to the whole of the United States we find that there 23.6 of United States birth per thousand of the population of the Province of Ontario.

I come now to another point, as established by the Canadian census returns, and that is the number of immigrants found in Canada in 1881. I do not, for my present purpose, take the published immigration figures; but as respects these, I may point out that the only figures that have been published in Canada are those of immigration. Figures of emigration have not been published, nor are they easily, if at all, obtainable. But, coming to the census record we find the fact that by the census of 1881 there were found in Canada 609,270 persons who were born outside of Canada, and therefore immigrants. That is to say, I think that the immigration into the Dominion has been, as nearly as possible, equal to the movement of the people from the Dominion to the United States. The figures are smaller, but if we consider the modes of census-taking the facts may be equal. There has, therefore, been very largely substitution of immigrants for native population.

This brings me to another consideration of very great importance. It is found that purely agricultural counties, in which there is no new land to take up, always give off a certain proportion of their population in the present state of agricultural industry. The fact is, that a farmer may have five or six sons, and when they come

up to manhood a number of them will go off the farm and look out for themselves. The figures that I have given show that they go where there is the attraction of land easily obtainable, or where there is the attraction of manufacturing or other pursuits. As showing the persistency of the movement from the rural districts of the United States to the urban, the figures of the United States population furnish facts of great interest. In the year 1830, when the population was nearly 13,000,000, there was only 6·7 per cent. of the whole population of the United States residing in the towns. Coming down to 1840, when the population was over 17,000,000, there was only 8·5 per cent. of the United States population resident in towns. Coming down again to 1880, it was found that there were 22·5 per cent., or nearly eleven and a-half millions of the United States population resident in cities of 8,000 inhabitants and over. The figures show that there has been a steady and increasing movement in the percentage every year, from 1790 to 1880, in that direction. There is, in further relation to this question, another fact of great interest, which I found in the report of a paper read by Dr. William Ogle, of the Registrar General's office of England, in the *Weekly Times* of the 27th of March last. He took fifteen of the leading agricultural counties in England, and omitting from them every urban district with a population of 10,000 or upwards, he showed that there had been a decline in the population of these fifteen leading counties in the thirty years, from 1851 to 1881, of 1 per cent.; but taking the period when the population was less dense, from 1801 to 1851, the fifty previous years, there had been an increase of no less than 73 per cent. Dr. Ogle is particular to state that the birth rate and death rate in these counties have not changed their ratio to each other. The fact is, therefore, proved that there has been an active emigration or migration from these counties, and Dr. Ogle further points out that that migration or emigration had taken the very flower of the population—that is, the young people between twenty and thirty years of age have left, leaving a very much larger percentage of persons over fifty-five years of age in these counties, a fact which has placed the population which remained in a weaker position. We get the same class of facts from other countries.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—Does that apply to the United States also?

Mr. LOWE.—I think the facts show undoubtedly that the same has applied to the United States.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—It seems to be the characteristic of the races everywhere?

Mr. LOWE.—In the present state of agriculture, a farming population of certain density will undoubtedly throw off every year an appreciable percentage of its numbers. That little table which I read to you, of the distribution of the population of the whole of the United States, shows the enormous magnitude of the displacement of population by the attraction of new land and industrial interests.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—Before we leave the question of the growth of cities, have you compared the changes in the emigration of the rural population to the cities with any of the large populous countries?

Mr. LOWE.—I have done it in relation to Canada, in so far as our census would enable me. The census of 1881 shows a decided movement from counties to cities. The rate of increase found in 1871, of urban to city population, was 14·09 per cent., and in 1881, 15·26. Our estimated population in 1889 would make the increase 16·83.

By Mr. BAIN :—

Q.—That is only an estimate, of course? A.—The 1889 is only estimated. It is based on the usual mode of considering established facts. The present population in the United States, of 1889, is estimated in the same way. It is found to be approximately correct. It is absolutely correct, if the same ratio is maintained.

Q.—It makes no allowance for disturbing causes? A.—The disturbing causes are supposed to correct each other, on the average, in such estimates.

By Mr. McNEILL:—

Q.—The rural districts do not include towns of 10,000 or over? A.—No. The United States statistics take urban populations of 8,000 for the comparison I have given you. We make comparisons with cities of 5,000. There is a further fact in connection with this subject, to which I may call the attention of the committee. Dr. Ogle takes the county of Huntingdonshire as one which is intensely rural. It had increased between 1801 and 1851 by 73 per cent.; but in the three latter decennial periods it had declined by 11·8. The figures of population which have moved were very considerable. Other facts may be found in that paper of Dr. Ogle's which I cannot give here, but I may refer the members of the committee to the copy of the *Times* I have stated. The paper is full of interest to any who have a desire to pursue the subject further.

By Mr. BAIN:—

Q.—What I was asking was this: If you had any comparative statement of the gross movement of the population to the cities in the old country as compared with the United States? A.—Those comparisons have not been very much made, as far as I have seen. This paper of Dr. Ogle is the most striking which I have seen on the subject.

Q.—But you see the one is of no use to compare with the other, as being isolated counties and for different periods? A.—You may take Dr. Ogle's statement to be a test of the movement of the rural population of England, from 1801 to 1881, to the cities and other countries.

Q.—Exactly; but we have only the American movement for the last ten years. Ten years against 100 is not a fair comparison. A.—I have given the American movement from agricultural population to urban from the beginning. I have this table from 1790 to 1880. In the former year the population of the United States was only 3,929,214, which was mainly an agricultural and commercial population on the east of the Appalachian Mountains. The cities of 8,000 only contained 3·3 per cent. of the population. That had increased in 1820 to 4·9; in 1830 to 6·7; in 1840 to 8·5; in 1850 to 12·5; in 1860 to 16·1; in 1870 to 20·9; and in 1880 to 22·5. The figures show steady persistency in the movement and that the ratio had risen from 1 in 33 to nearly 1 in 4.

Q.—Can you give us the English figures for the same period? A.—I cannot give them to you in the same form. I have not the figures as between the rural and urban; but I have here the percentage of total increase from 1811.

Q.—That would be of no value as a comparison? A.—No; but the English increases are important for one feature, and that is a main feature. They show that after allowing for that movement of migration from the counties to the towns, and also for the emigration, that the increase per cent. of the population of England and Wales, in ten years, was 14·34 in 1881 and 13·19 in 1871, for the ten years previous. There is not very much change in the figures of increases in England since 1811. They are much less rapid than the ratios in the United States, which more than double those of England. Then there is this fact in relation to our own figures—that is, that our own increase in the last ten years was 17·3 per cent. That is very much less than the increase in the United States, but the fact of our having an increase so large as 17·3 is at least a fact which possesses some features of very great interest. My contention is, that we owe that percentage of increase, following the movement I have shown to the United States, to the fact of the large proportion of immigration to our population. There is no reason to believe that the condition of the people of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and others of the Eastern States is at all inferior in vital force. It is held by the United States statist that it is quite an error to suppose that there is any failure of the birth-rate in the New England States. The fact of the State of Maine showing a decline of decimal 2 per cent. of its population in the same

decenniad as compared with our increase of 17·3; and the fact of New Hampshire showing an increase of only 2 per cent. and Vermont 5 per cent. in the same period, against our 17·3, must have some good reason. We owe that difference entirely to immigration. These figures are proof, to my mind, of the fact of substitution; and, if the immigration had not taken the place of emigration, our population would have shown actual decline, or no increase, in the same way as the New England States I have referred to. Our comparatively large increase—larger by 3 per cent. than that of England—is undoubtedly owing to the effect of substitution, and I think its value may be described as enormous. In fact, it is not easily appreciated until we come to look into the detail of the figures and see what they imply. There has been in Canada the operation of that law of population—that is to say, that when a rural population approaches a certain density, with the present methods of agriculture, there is always a very large percentage thrown off. Young men will go from the paternal farm to look out for themselves. They will either go to the cities where they can find work in the many manufactories, as French Canadians have done to New England, or they will go, as many more very lately have, to unoccupied portions of the continent, where land is easily obtainable. The very fact of the existence of large available quantities of land on this continent is a fact which will go to show that it will be followed up by settlement, especially if there are any means of communication; and the settlement will even go on in advance of the means of communication.

Dr. WILSON.—Admitting all that, do you think that the population of Canada has increased in a relative ratio to which the population of the United States has increased up to the present time—admitting all that you have said to be true?

Mr. LOWE.—The population of the whole Dominion of Canada has not by any means increased in the same rapid proportion as the population of the whole United States.

Dr. WILSON.—Then your theory fails. What we want to see is, that in Canada our population, as a whole, is retaining its position on an equality with the United States and other countries.

Mr. LOWE.—If Dr. Wilson would allow me an explanation on that point, I would say that I have endeavored to avoid the making of theories, as far as possible. I have simply wished to give facts.

Dr. WILSON.—Then your theory, as far as the utility of that theory is applied to Canada is concerned, is useless, as far as we are concerned here. We have had big expectations, but we have not realized them.

Mr. LOWE.—The committee may still take the facts I have stated on which to base opinions according to the views of the individual members. It is not, however, a theory but a fact, which has been proved by demonstration, that where there are large tracts of cultivable land on this continent open for settlement, under conditions favorable for settlement, these conditions will be availed of; and my own belief is, that history will repeat itself in the same way as in Europe. Europe was first settled from the south. The tide of population and civilization went up from Spain to the northern parts of Europe, which are now dominant in population and potentiality. If any theory can be attached to the important facts which I have laid before the Committee, it is the inference that in America population will overflow from old centres to new, where there are plenty of available land and industrial resources to open up. I have very nearly completed the statement, and I will endeavor to fatigue the committee as little as possible.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).—Before you leave the question of the movement of the population into the unoccupied agricultural lands, there is this difficulty with the whole question—that the basis upon which you figure is away back in 1880. Now, we are really missing eight or nine years, which ought to have been the most active period when we could draw population into our unoccupied territory.

Mr. LOWE.—I have, of course, opinions in regard to that; but in the statement I have endeavored to give the committee I have thought it best to confine myself as nearly as possible to enumerated facts. I have given the latest of such.

Mr. BAIN.—But your figures only come down to 1880. That is the difficulty I see.

Mr. LOWE.—Yes; the United States figures only come down to 1880. But, of course, you can make calculations by the logarithmic process.

Mr. BAIN.—The misfortune is, where our own official census comes in in the North-West it don't accord with these figures.

Mr. LOWE.—Mr. Bain, that brings quite another question.

Mr. BAIN.—There is a wide hiatus there.

Mr. LOWE.—The figures of the census of the Territories and of Manitoba, that were taken in 1885 and 1886, have been very much misunderstood, and I really cannot account for the extent to which they have been misunderstood. The quinquennial census of the Territories referred only to three districts which were taken. There was a nearly stationary population in the districts not taken. What has happened is this: that the three districts taken have been compared with the whole of the territory, of which the census was taken in 1881, including a further population of thirty or forty thousand, and therefore there has been that much error in the inferences which I have seen drawn.

Mr. BAIN.—We could not find the people that our returns stated had gone in there.

Mr. LOWE.—I have not brought the figures here relating to that point, but I may say that, while it is undoubtedly shown the North-West suffered loss of population after the collapse of the "boom," there has been great increase; and we now calculate that, taking the year 1889 we ought to have a population of 146,545 in Manitoba, 106,000 in the Territories, and 150,999 in British Columbia.

I do not mean to say there have been no discrepancies, but these figures of estimated increase of population are based on the whole not part, as has been done in error, of the previous enumerations, for our own information in the Department, and certainly we do not try to deceive ourselves.

I recur to that word substitution. There has been, as I have stated, a substitution to a very large extent, even to an enormous extent. Owing to that substitution we show an increase of population (in ten years) of 17·3 per cent., instead of a little increase, or a decline, as in the States of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont; and, instead of actual decline of population, as in the leading agricultural counties of England, where Dr. Ogle has stated the vitality is as strong as it ever was before, but where there has been a migration of the rural population, owing to that law of population, if the committee will allow me to use that word, in relation to circumstances I have stated.

By Mr. McNEILL :—

Q.—Is this in ten years? A.—This is the fact as shown by our last census of 1881. Then, with regard to those 609,220 immigrants whom we found by our census as being in Canada, I am not going to speak of our figures of immigration as published by us, but which, as I have said, do not also contain the figures of the emigration. I do not want to put any statement that will raise any kind of doubt. I therefore simply take the facts of population as we find them from the census in dealing with the question of numbers.

It is found both in the United States and Canada that on an average all the immigrants, rich and poor, bring with them \$60 per head. That alone would make \$36,500,000. If the total immigration itself were capitalized after the fashion adopted by the American Bureau of Statistics seventeen years ago it would give us the capital

value of \$609,000,000. If we divide that population by five to reduce it to families, and say that each head earns only \$400 per year, and that would not be a very large amount for the head of a family, not allowing anything for the women and young people, it would give an amount of production or productive value of \$48,731,600 per annum. These figures are very large, but it cannot be disputed that the immigrant population brought into our country, as shown by our census of 1881, is a fact of actual and of very large value, compared with which all the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway is insignificant.

By Mr. SEMPLE:—

Q.—Has Mr. Lowe made a comparison of the money expended in Canada and the United States on immigration? A.—No; but I can very readily do so. If the gentleman would like to have an opinion from me on that subject I have not the slightest objection to give it. I am perfectly satisfied of this, that more than \$10 to \$1 or \$15 to \$1 have been expended on behalf of the United States for immigration as compared with Canada. I say by the United States, because it has been paid mainly from the United States public lands domain. The United States have alienated hundreds of millions of acres of land, and the people to whom these lands have been alienated have spent money like water in promoting immigration for settlement on them. Therefore, the lands domain of the United States has gone to pay for that expenditure.

By Mr. TROW:—

Q.—The United States Government proper does not pay anything, however. A.—No; not towards that form of promoting immigration, but they now levy a tax upon immigrants arriving, and this is practically a tax on commerce, being paid by the ship, and not by individual immigrants, which the Imperial Passenger's Act will not permit, and from this an amount of about \$160,000 a year is expended for the care of immigrants at New York. Our figures are small as compared with this.

J. T. CAREY, called and examined.

The CHAIRMAN.—I would like to say, before Mr. Carey addresses the committee, that what he proposes to protest against is assisted immigration. The committee knows very well, however, that the Department has abandoned altogether the policy of assisting immigrants, and I suppose it would not be worth while taking up a great deal of time in discussing or advising the abandonment of a system which has been already abandoned.

Dr. WILSON.—I think you are a little in error, because the Minister stated it was the intention to pay a certain \$2 per head for bringing children out to this country. Therefore, your statement hardly conveys a correct impression.

Mr. CAREY.—It is the \$2 for the assisted passages, or the premiums paid on the passages of these orphans, that we most object to at the present time. I think, of course, as a working man, that we are more injured through the past immigration system of the Government than any other class in the country. We do not object to *bonâ fide* immigrants—that is, those who come out of their own free will. Those who are able and willing to pay their own way and come to this country, we are satisfied, from past experience, make good citizens, and are a benefit to the country; but those who do not seem to be good citizens in the country which they left, do not seem to be of any benefit to us, and are an injury more than a benefit. I have no objection to persons going to the farming districts. Those who stay in the city, however, must live there, as those who have to work there know to their cost. The fact of there being more people in the cities in the winter time than there is work for them makes it hard, not only for the citizens who live there, but for the people who come. Consequently, while work is scarcer in the winter time there are more people to do the work than is usually found in the summer. That makes it not only hard for the

immigrants but the people who are here. I have a report from the Inspector of Orphan Asylums of Ontario for 1888, who says that in the Kingston House of Providence there were classified as Canadians 40, English 115, and other countries 4; while the Hotel Dieu Asylum has 46 Canadians and 67 English. Kingston and some of those other places seem to get more of the children than is necessary. Now, we do not believe that we should be taxed to keep the orphans of people who should keep them themselves. We have orphans enough in our own country, and the statistics we have collected show that there are more orphans who are imported into this country—in our orphan asylums—than there are natives. Consequently, we think it would be better for us and better for all concerned if the bonus now paid upon the orphans was dropped as well as the assisted passage. We wish it to be distinctly understood that we have no objection to any *bona fide* immigrant coming, who is willing to pay his own way and able to do it, because we are satisfied from past experience that he will be a benefit to the country; but the people, as a rule, who have been assisted have been of no use to the country that they were in, and consequently it is only natural that when they come out here that they will be just as useless to us as they were to the people of the old country.

Gentlemen, I have some evidence here concerning the people whom we assisted during the last winter. These are the numbers who had received assistance, who could not find work, and, consequently, were left to look for assistance. If the committee are willing I will read it to them, so that they can see for themselves. The figures collected last winter are collected from one or two points. The Toronto Relief Society relieved 807 families, embracing 4,035 persons. There were many among those who had never before known want. The society applied to the city council for an increased grant. Over 60 grown people got a free breakfast on 2nd December, 1888, in Richmond Hall. In December the Irish Benevolent Society provided for 100 families, numbering 500 persons or thereabouts. That is on the 25th December. The House of Industry accommodated 80 to 150 so-called tramps during the night previous, and on Saturday night, the 22nd, there were 42 there. From the 17th to the 22nd they numbered 196, and that is with comparatively fine weather for that time of the year. On December 25th, 1888, the House of Providence gave food and shelter to no less than 155 men, 215 women and 150 children. On 30th December, 1888, no less than 178 men and women got a free breakfast in the morning, and in the evening a free supper from the Relief Society in Richmond Hall. On Christmas Eve the St. George's Society assisted 3,500 people, many of whom were only in Canada a few months, but could get no work, no matter how willing they were to do it. On Christmas Day 300 men and women were treated to meals in Richmond Hall by that society. Mayor Clarke, of Toronto, made a return stating that relieving office had relieved no less than 2,174 persons during the year. Of that number 432 had resided in Canada under one year, 343 over one year, 231 over two years and under three years, 820 over three years and 258 unknown. Their time in Toronto was, under one month, 461; over one month and under two months, 164; over two months and under three months, 130; over three months and under four months, 96; over four months and under five months, 197; over five months and under six months, 186; over six months and under one year, 212; over two years, 648; and unknown, 258. This was dated 1st January, 1889. This does not include the 982 persons provided for in the Industrial Home during December, nor the 125 who received a free breakfast in Richmond Hall on the 27th January, or the 100 who received food and clothing at the same hall on the 24th of the same month. During the first fourteen days of January, 1889, no less than 163 people were admitted to the casual ward of the House of Industry. The total number admitted during the month was 668, besides out-door relief in the shape of 134 tons coal, 325 bushels coke, 57 cords wood, 6,520 lbs. bread, 470 lbs. rice, 470 lbs. oatmeal, 310 lbs. sugar, and 95 lbs. tea, to 635 families, aggregating 3,765 persons, of whom 1,253 were children, and all this from the 1st to the 14th of the month. Mr. Chairman, we have had these batches of orphan paupers arriving by steamship "Vancouver" on 3rd April,

under the supervision, I believe, of the Rev. S. H. Fullerton. The three batches numbered 231 in all, two lots coming from London and one from Manchester. So that I hope, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the committee will see their way clear to stop assisted passages or paying bonuses for bringing these children out. I have lived now nineteen or twenty years within ten or eleven miles of Miss Rye's training school at Niagara. I have seen a good deal of these orphans during that time, and we do not wish to make any statement whatever; but we think it only fair to the working classes of this country to do them that justice to which they are entitled, by stopping the payment of these bonuses. We are just as well entitled to protection as any other class of the community; and, consequently, we do not think it right to tax us to bring people to this country to compete with us in the labor market. It causes wages to be low and keeps the people unemployed. It causes a great deal more suffering than gentlemen in the position you occupy know anything about. You do not see poverty in its entirety, as we do; and, consequently, we are satisfied that if you only knew the actual position of some of the working classes of the present day here, gentlemen would not think a second time about stopping assisted passages altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR.—With reference to that statement you read about the number of persons who received assistance in Toronto, you do not say that any or all of them, or how many, received assisted passages, or if any. The statement is that paupers are there, and that they require assistance; but you don't make the statement that any of them received assistance from the Government in coming out to this country. Of course, the Government have abandoned assisted passages to immigrants, but I don't want the impression to be left that those who received assistance in Toronto were those who received assisted passages.

Mr. CAREY.—Mr. Chairman, we did not hunt that fact up. Perhaps we could not find it if we tried. The fact of it being necessary for so many working people to receive assistance during the winter I think should convince honorable gentlemen that there are already at the present time people enough here in poverty without bringing more to assist us in our poverty. I do not wish to leave the impression that we state that these people were assisted immigrants, but we do state that the people were in want or they would not have taken assistance. Consequently, if we have more people than there is employment for we cannot see the necessity of bringing people here for the scanty work that these people have to engage in.

Mr. TROW.—With reference to that statement made by Mr. Carey about the large number that were entertained to a free breakfast in Toronto and other places, it is natural to suppose that if people were ever charitable it would be about that season of the year. These people are invited. Notices are spread broadcast that free dinners will be given, and the invited parties assemble in large numbers on that particular occasion; but it must not be taken for granted that these parties are assisted in the same numbers during other seasons of the year.

Gen. LAURIE.—I hardly think the inference a fair one, because I know an employer of labor who entertains 150 people every Christmas day. Because many of these have been immigrants I do not think it is reasonable to say these were people that should not have been brought to the country.

Mr. HESSON.—What has been Mr. Trow's experience with reference to the children brought out to his town? He might be able to say whether they are returned to the society to maintain them afterwards?

Mr. TROW.—Mr. Hesson is probably more competent to give his experience than I am with reference to these children in Stratford. I have never heard any complaints. I have heard a claim far more repeatedly urged by persons who could not obtain orphans to adopt in Stratford—not merely one, but dozens. I know that Mrs. Trow was there last week and said she could not obtain one. She is very anxious to obtain a girl ten or fifteen years of age to train up. She found, however,

that all had been taken immediately on their arrival. It is my experience that both boys and girls, on their arrival, are met by farmers and farmers' wives, who adopt them into their homes. They are indentured, and letters of agreement entered into between the matron and the parties who adopt these children, and they are kept on and, as a rule, give general satisfaction. I have heard of very few complaints. I believe that 50 per cent. more, if brought out to Stratford, could be accommodated in the farming community for miles around, if not in the town.

Dr. SPROULE.—Did Mr. Carey mean to say that those in the institution at Kingston were permanent occupants there?

Mr. CAREY.—The figures I have taken are from the annual report of the Inspector of Orphan Asylums. They must be there permanently to get into that report. The report gives the nationalities of the different children in the Home.

Mr. TAYLOR.—The inference that I presume it was thought the committee might draw was, that this number of English immigrants had come out under assisted passages. Now, the contrary may be the fact. An Englishman might have been in this country for ten years, and he or his wife having been called away his children were put in there. He might have paid his passage out here and have been doing well for a time. The inference was, that these were the children or persons brought out under assisted passages. There might not have been one of these children who had been brought out by Miss Rye, or by any one of those agencies.

Dr. WILSON.—Mr. Carey did not say that these children were all brought out, but there were at the present time in our various institutions a sufficient number of this class of children. Now, I have no objection to my friend, Mr. Trow, saying that the greater portion of these are taken, and turn out well. We do not pretend to say that all turn out badly; but what I desire is, that the impression should not go abroad that we have not enough of these pauper children in this country. We should consider, in the first place, whether we have not in the country at the present time a sufficient number of these unfortunate children. If we have, would it not be the duty of this Legislature and the duty of the country to see that these children who are in these institutions, whether they have been here one, two, five or ten years, it matters not, should be taken and utilized, and sent to the farmers in the different parts, instead of taking the pauper children from the old country and bringing them over here, at the expense of the Government, while our orphans are being supported in these institutions. If it is the expression of opinion that we ought to bring over more of these children, let them say it.

Mr. TAYLOR.—I would not like to say that these children in the Hotel Dieu, at Kingston, are pauper children. I know of three families in Gananoque who sent their children there, and Dr. Wilson nor no one else could get those children. They are not pauper children; they are being paid for.

Dr. WILSON.—Does Mr. Taylor pretend to say that we have no pauper children supported by the Province of Ontario in those institutions? There may be some who pay a certain amount for their maintenance, and who would not allow their children to go out. I do not think that I conveyed that impression, but what I did convey was, that at the expenses of the Province of Ontario to-day we have these various institutions, and any of you can refer to the reports and see the number of children that we have there. What I desired to convey was this, that if we had not enough of these pauper children in our midst. What my friend, Mr. Carey, conveyed, was that he thought, judging from the numbers in these various institutions, we have enough of the pauper children here, and that it was imprudent at the present time that State aid should be granted to bring out to this country a greater number. I do not know whether my friend, Mr. Trow, would go to some of these provincial institutions where the pauper children are and take one out of them. Perhaps he would not. He would rather go to some of these other institutions and adopt a child from the old country. He may have a greater preference for them than he has for

Canadian children. If you can convince me that we, to-day, in the Dominion of Canada, have not enough of these pauper children, then bring them over. If we have, I say it is bad policy for us to give aid and to bring out a large number of a class that we have already an excess of.

Mr. HESSON—I would like to say a word or two with reference to the statement of Dr. Wilson. I regret he uses the words pauper children so generally. Throughout the whole of this discussion it seems to be a talk against pauper children, as if this Government had been undertaking the work of bringing pauper children into this country. With reference to these children, let me speak of what I know exists in my own community. There is not a better Home, perhaps, in Canada, than the Home there, not excepting the hon. member's home. He ought to adopt a few of the orphans; but I will just say to my hon. friend that I do know that the work that is being done there is not maintained at the expenses of the public. There is not one dollar contributed by any corporation or by any association, except through the benevolence of the people who wish to assist her in her good work and carry it on successfully. I will say to my hon. friend, that instead of taking pauper children and outcasts of society, on the contrary the greatest care is exercised by the people who spend their time and their money in this great work. The parents of the children may be dead, or the father or mother may be dead, and the children thrown upon the hands of strangers. They are looked after, and they are educated, and the children are brought up under good guidance, until such time as they are distributed, and after they have had a year's training, perhaps, if necessary. I am glad to say that they are not permitted to stay there very long, because they are wanted. Applications are made before they really arrive; but I do say, from experience of the working of Miss Macpherson's Home at Stratford, under Mrs. Merry and others associated with them in the good work, I have not heard of one single instance of a child being returned and becoming a charge on the community. They are taken away by people who are glad to get them. If it is a question of bringing in pauper children into this country with Government aid to assist in that direction, I don't think it would be anything but right to protest against it. But if my hon. friend will, in making his reference, bear in mind that many of these children are orphans, and not paupers, nor necessarily paupers, but that they might be considered a charge upon the whole community, and have the hearty sympathy of the whole community, and ought not to be classed with the outcasts of society. I fully endorse all Mr. Trow has said in reference to what has come to our own knowledge, and I only speak from that point, but I protest against Dr. Wilson, or any one else, charging that all these children brought out into this country by these kind-hearted people should be classed among the outcasts.

Dr. SPROULE.—I think what I have said is *à propos*. As I understand it, these orphanages or Homes come under the inspection of the Provincial Government. They are not supported solely by the Provincial Government, but they give a grant to each of them, and therefore all come under provincial inspection, and on account of that the number is given as read by Mr. Carey here; but I would like to say to the committee that many members know that they are largely supported by the charitably disposed people of the country; and our own country, like all others, must have their Homes, because there are periods in the life of every child when education must be attended to, whether by the State or at the expense of private individuals. There is no doubt that a large number of orphan children coming from the old country are put into these institutions for a certain time before being left in the different parts of the country. I say that there is not a supply equal to the demand in our rural districts of the country for these children when they come to that useful period of life that they can be set out amongst the agriculturists of the country. I know from my own section of the country that when they are brought there, 125 at a time, that after three days has elapsed the children are all scattered through the country, and I have not yet heard of the first instance where one of them was returned to the Home as being useless or unsuitable. Regarding the assistance that

the Government gave them, I understand that they have not been assisted in their passage, but they gave \$2 per head for each child that is brought into this country, to be used in defraying expenses up to the time that they are distributed in the various localities where they are afterwards employed. It is not to assist in bringing them here; it is not to pay their passage, but it is only to pay the expenses while distribution is being made in the country. The Home at Niagara has been spoken of. I know several applicants who have been obliged to come back without being supplied from that Home. The many children distributed in my section of the country have proved very useful to the people there, and a large number could have been located in that section of the country had they been available there that time. Stratford has also been applied to, and some distributed from the Marchmont have, at Belleville and these other institutions, been doing this important work in connection with those orphans who have been deprived of the protection and care of their parents at a time of life when they are unable to care for themselves. They are taken there, and they are educated until they come to that time of life when they are useful, and then they are distributed to the people of the country, and the supply up to the present, as far as I can see, has never been equal to the demand.

Gen. LAURIE.—Mrs. Burt wrote to me last night that she had arrived at Halifax on the 24th of March. Her institution is distinctly Protestant, but to show you the feeling there, where 500 of her children are, she was met at the wharf by the Speaker of the House of Assembly and Mr. McNeil, both of them Roman Catholics. (Gen. Laurie here read a portion of Mrs. Burt's letter, showing how quickly the children had been taken on their arrival.) Her previous letter tells me that she had 1,000 applications, and I think there can be no better proof than that, that there is not a sufficient number in the country. If the remaining 800 want them they cannot get them from the sources mentioned. The \$2 per head paid by the Government to these institutions is that they may maintain a supervision over the children after they are here, and to prevent them from getting into these institutions that have been referred to. They are not brought into competition with the labor of the towns, but are placed out with the farmers; and if from any cause they prove unsuitable, they are taken back to the institutions from which they came. The very charge Mr. Carey brings against them is in favor of continuing this system, since this \$2 is given to prevent these children from ever becoming a charge on the community. I had a letter last night to say that these children pass a medical inspection weekly during the time they are in the training school at home. They are carefully watched, and are kept there for at least six months under supervision, and any not considered suitable for emigration are disposed of otherwise. Out of 212 children taken into the Home at Liverpool, only 168 were brought to this country, because the others were not considered good enough for Canada.

Dr. BRIEN.—It is very strange that the statement made here should be so contradicted by the statement made by the Government agent at Hamilton. Out of the forty-six, he reports that they are either bad in habits or diseased; and considering the source they come from, I think they are objectionable. As I read in the House, these are children picked up from the streets of London, of the worst class. I think it is important that the moral standard of this country should be maintained and that these children should not be brought here.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 17th April, 1889.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture met this day. Mr. White (Renfrew), Chairman, presided.

Gen. LAURIE.—Mr. Chairman, I have to express to the members of the committee, who were associated with me, my hearty thanks for the exceedingly pleasant

manner in which we all worked together, and for the great assistance they one and all gave in going through all the evidence of preparing this report.

Dr. SPROULE.—I move that this report be adopted and embodied in the report of our committee. I think the report reflects great credit upon the honorable gentlemen who were connected with the investigation and who made the report. I must say that this is a very valuable report, and it should be printed and distributed.

Mr. TROW.—I cordially agree with the reference to the value of the report.

Dr. MACDONALD.—Gen. Laurie deserves the thanks of the committee for the great attention he has paid to this matter. Certainly the greater portion of the work fell on Gen. Laurie.

EVIDENCE



PART II

AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 4th April, 1889.

The Agriculture and Colonization Committee met this morning, Mr. White (Renfrew) presiding. Following were the proceedings:—

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it would be better if Mr. Saunders should be allowed to make his statement to the end, leaving any question that any member of the committee desires to ask him until after he has completed his statement in the main. Mr. Saunders, I would ask you, without propounding a series of questions from the chair, to make a statement of the working of the farm, and the experiments made by you, to the committee.

Professor SAUNDERS.—The first point that I will draw your attention to in connection with the farm work is the question of Ladoga wheat, respecting which a bulletin has just been issued, and of which copies are here for distribution. There has been a great deal of discussion regarding this wheat since its introduction—as to its quality, as to its earliness and as to its general usefulness as a hard wheat. You will find in that bulletin a very great difference of opinion expressed by the bodies of experts to which the wheat has been submitted. The samples which have been sent to these experts were all put up by myself, so that I can vouch for their being exactly alike and the same as the sample here shown. You will see, by looking over the table in the bulletin, where a comparison of the statements has been made, that the same sample has been very differently graded by the several Boards of Trade and experts. These are among the best men that we have in this country for such work, yet we find difference of value in their grading of the same sample amounting to 10 cents per bushel in value, a very important point to those who have grain to sell, seeing that the prices are fixed by these grain inspectors. I believe the opinions have been all honestly given, but their great differences, which I am unable to explain, and must leave with you to think over and form your own opinion on. You have in this bulletin not only the results of the grading of this wheat, but you will also find the opinions of some of the growers with regard to its earliness; and, taking the whole Dominion over, the farmers who have expressed an opinion on the wheat—and there are some 300 this year—state that it is on an average of ten days earlier than the Red Fife. With regard to the quality, I have some of the identical samples here which were submitted to the different Boards of Trade, and every member can examine them at his leisure. I have also the flour that has been produced from this Ladoga wheat, along with the flour of the Red Fife. The Red Fife wheat was grown alongside of the Ladoga, and both were ground in the same quantity and at the same mill, so that the test is a fair one. Bread has also been baked from this Ladoga flour and Red Fife flour, so that members of the committee will have an opportunity of examining and judging for themselves as to the character of the bread which the flour of the Ladoga will make, and how it compares with that very excellent variety known as the Red Fife. There is not, as I have explained to the Boards of Trade, any intention in this introduction to endeavor to set aside the Red Fife; on the contrary, it is the purpose of the Minister to encourage the growing of Red Fife wherever it can be grown with a reasonable amount of certainty, but as there are large districts, involving a very considerable area in our North-West, where the growth of the Red Fife is manifestly uncertain, it is in those districts especially where we hope this wheat will prove useful. It is believed this wheat may be grown in quantity and find its way into the market without depreciating the value of Canadian hard wheats, but that it will rank deservedly among the better class of hard wheats in this country. The reputation of Canadian hard wheats is so good now, and it is a matter of such national importance, that the greatest care should be taken in introducing new varieties into general cultivation, to see that that reputation be maintained. In the second part of Bulletin 4 there is given full details of the analyses of Ladoga, Red Fife and some other sorts. The experiments at the farm have not been limited to any one variety of wheat. Seventy-four varieties of spring wheats have been grown last year. Their relative fertility has been tested, and as

full particulars obtained in regard to that as the short time we have had would permit us to do. Among the new varieties of spring wheat there are a large number from Europe and many from the United States. The most promising of these we have tested among the hard wheats are the Ladoga, Red Fife and the Red Fern. Pringle's Champlain also promises to be reasonably hard. We have not grown this latter to the extent we have the Ladoga, and I am not prepared to offer any very positive opinion in regard to them. The Red Fern has been spoken of with considerable favor by the Toronto Milling Co., and attention has been called to it by them. It is claimed that the flour made from it is equal quite to any of the other varieties of hard wheat. I have no opinion as yet to offer in regard to this matter. At the outset, when the farm work was begun, a large number of samples of grain were obtained at the Corn Exchange in London for testing, and among others five samples of Indian grain. It was not expected there would be anything of special value in grains from India for this country, but when these varieties began to ripen it was found that they were all very early, ripening as early as most of the Russian wheats. This was a matter of surprise to me. Some enquiries were made in regard to this subject, and information is being got from India, which I hope will be of some value to this country. Under instruction of the Minister of Agriculture, correspondence was opened with the Government of India; and Lord Dufferin, who was then Viceroy, kindly issued instructions to the agricultural officers in the Empire to have samples of grain from the mountainous districts of India, where early varieties are grown, sent to Canada, for the purpose of being tested, and I have samples, which I can show to the members of the committee, of different varieties of wheat grown at an elevation of 2,000 feet to 11,000 feet in the mountainous districts of India, where the season is comparatively short. The Indian Government are also sending for testing to the Experimental Farm a number of different sorts of fodder plants grown in India for the feeding of horses and cattle, and some other plants used as food by the natives. Some of those may prove of value, and will no doubt be of interest, as they will give us information in regard to that country. Several new varieties of wheat have also been brought under my notice in Canada during the last few months. One was spoken of by one of the hon. members of the Commons, Mr. Davin, as having been grown near Regina, under the name of Judket wheat. I have received some of that wheat, and shall be able to submit a sample to the members. It seems to be a promising wheat, very much like the Red Fife in its growth. Mr. Sanders, of Moose Jaw, who writes me on the subject, says that he grew this Ladoga and this Judket wheat along side of each other, and it was nearly a week earlier than the Ladoga. If that is correct, and the sample of wheat is a good one, it promises to be of great value. This year it will be tested on the different Experimental Farms in Manitoba and the North-West, and on the Central Farm here, so that I shall be able to ascertain shortly what its special merits are. Another wheat that has come to the front in the North-West, which was shown at one or two of the exhibitions, is a variety called the Eureka. It is also a hard wheat, which Mr. Beatty, of Virden, Man., who is disseminating it, says he has shown as Red Fife, and that the wheat has taken first prize as Red Fife at some of the exhibitions.

Mr. WATSON.—How does it compare with Red Fern?

Professor SAUNDERS.—Quite closely. It seems, however, to be a little shorter in the berry, and I think it is a different wheat, but in this I may be mistaken. Another new wheat that has been sent me lately is the Triumph, raised by Mr. David Campbell, of Nottawa. He says that he found this wheat growing on his farm some years ago, that a single plant of it among some other wheat attracted his attention. He selected that plant, and has continued to cultivate it ever since. He finds it to be a very fertile variety. It is a soft wheat, not adapted for the North-West, but may prove a very useful wheat for Ontario. Another soft wheat which promises to be useful for Ontario has been sent me from the Mormon settlement, near Fort McLeod. It is a variety which originated at Salt Lake, and is called the Early Sanora. It has very plump, round kernel, handsome in appearance, and will, no doubt, make a

very white flour. Mr. Farrow, who sends this, is a leading man among the Mormons, and says it is a wheat he could always get 5 cents more per bushel for, at Salt Lake, than any other variety he could grow. Some gentleman was asking if I had the particulars of the origin of these wheats?

Mr. HESSON.—I enquired.

Professor SAUNDERS.—I can only give you the information that was given me by the producer. In regard to the Eureka wheat, it is offered for sale by Mr. G. J. Beatty, of Virden, Manitoba. He says: "I got it in the northern part of Ontario, from a Norwegian, who brought a small quantity from his home. One bushel and a-half cost me \$4.50 here. I have sown it three times, and had this season 2,000 bushels. Next year I propose seeding with it alone. It has been always graded by Mr. Ditton, grain inspector here, as No. 1 Fife. He says it is impossible for anyone to distinguish between it and Red Fife. Millers say that for milling purposes it is equal to the best Fife, and yields on an average about seven bushels per acre better. It has a far more vigorous growth from the start. It does not require as strong land as the Fife, and stands drouth far better. Just here I would say: if you sow any, do not pick a piece of rich, mellow land, if you want a good yield, as if too strong and mellow you will grow too heavy a crop of straw; let the land be firm. I got first prize at Virden (the only place exhibited) in competing with eight entries of Fife; two millers and a grain dealer were the judges. I have yet to see the first smut-ball in it." That is what is said about the Eureka. Mr. Sanders, of Moose Jaw, in speaking of the Judket wheat, says: "I brought out this wheat from Ontario in 1885. I sowed it last year, 1st May, and cut it ten days before the Red Fife, which I sowed 21st April, and it was ripe when cut. It is a beardless wheat, very much in appearance like Red Fife. It yielded over fifty-five bushels to the acre last year. It is about a week earlier than the Ladoga. I consider my sowing of last year a good test. All the conditions of sowing and cultivation were alike." These comprise, I think, the chief varieties which have lately come to my notice, and of course you will understand that I cannot offer any opinion on them. I give these particulars to show we are looking out for hard wheats everywhere, but they must be of good quality if their growth is to be encouraged. We must maintain the reputation gained for our hard wheats, because that is of vital importance if the North-West country is to make that progress which it should. There are only two methods by which new varieties of wheat are obtained: one of these is by selection and the other by a cross-fertilization. Most of the varieties in cultivation have been obtained by selection. The Red Fife originated in that way. An accidental plant growing in a field of wheat was noticed to have certain valuable characteristics. That seed was saved, and propagated by a Mr. Fife, of Otonabee, Ontario, and that was the origin of the Fife wheat. In the same way the Chevalier barley was introduced by the Rev. Mr. Chevalier, of England. He saw a stalk growing near a manure heap. He saved the seed of that plant, and kept on selecting, and until he had accumulated a large quantity of choice grain, which was the foundation of all the Chevalier barley. I mention this to show that this system of selection has not been confined to wheat. The process for obtaining new varieties by cross-fertilization requires a skilful operator and delicate manipulation, with a thorough knowledge of the sexual organs of the flower of the wheat, and hence is only attempted by very few people. Carter & Co., the large seedsmen, of London, England, have employed an expert at this work for some years past, and they will have at, the close of this season, about nine or ten varieties of wheat, which they call cross-bred wheats, some of which seem to have great promise, and the Experimental Farm will be supplied with the first samples distributed. That class of work has been undertaken at the farm here. During the last season we succeeded in effecting several crosses of the Ladoga with the Red Fife, and the Red Fife with the Ladoga, and also with other varieties, and shall have probably twenty or thirty new varieties of grain from the past season's work. We have to begin in this case with a single grain, and it takes some years before enough can be had to test it on a large scale; yet from the figures which we have reached by calcu-

lation from the results of a growth of a single grain this year on the farm, it appears that 500 pounds of grain can, with careful manipulation, in a favorable season, be grown on well prepared land from one pound of seed; so that, even starting from a single grain a variety may be available for general cultivation much sooner than one would at first expect. With regard to the ripening of the Indian varieties, I might say that they have ripened in each case about ten or eleven days earlier than Red Fife. Some seventy-four varieties of wheat have been grown this year on the Central Experimental Farm.

By Mr. HESSON:—

Q.—Is that winter wheat? A.—No, sir; these are all spring wheats. Most of these seventy-four varieties of wheat have been grown in field plots, and all of them as single plants, a foot apart. They have been grown in that way in order to ascertain their relative vigor and relative fertility. It might interest the members to know that the average product, taking a selected plant from each of these varieties, has been 631 fold. In experiments conducted in Europe in this way the largest yield I know of is 300 fold on an average, showing that our climate is well adapted to develop the fertility of wheat. This class of experiments has been undertaken with several objects in view, one of which is to endeavor to infuse into the constitution of the several varieties experimented on additional vigor and productiveness, with a hope of making them more permanently fertile. All the varieties of wheat are believed to be self-fertilizing. The sexual organs in the flower are so covered by portions of the chaff that it is with a great deal of difficulty that they are exposed, and there seems no possibility of their being cross-fertilized by pollen from other plants; and it does appear, from the experiments tried thus far, that grain so fertilized has a power to hold any impression it may receive from without with very great tenacity, so that a grain of wheat or barley, such as the Chevalier barley, which I referred to, having once been impressed with this additional vigor and the seed carefully selected, it will be retained by the variety under cultivation for a very long period. If that idea is correct, and I think it is, it is a very important thing that we should endeavor to improve the varieties we have. In the experiments at the Farm the Red Fife, White Fife, Ladoga and all the other standard varieties have grown alongside of many new varieties. Selected samples of the largest and plump-est grain have been made. Of these, sufficient quantities have been sent to each of the Experimental Farms, so that these tests may be repeated, not only here, but in the Maritime Provinces, in the North-West and in Manitoba. We hope that under the more favorable condition of soil and climate for these hard wheats in the North-West that we may be able to originate select varieties, such as are known in Europe as ennobled and pedigreed wheats, and which have been produced in this way there by selecting the best grain, until that particular seed has been brought up to near the maximum point of its development. Experience has shown that each seed retains the quality which is impressed upon it by this process, and such seed, when generally distributed in this country, will, no doubt, bring about a much larger yield to the farmers—a gain of great value to the country.

Mr. TEMPLE.—Speaking of White Fife, is that the Scotch White Fife?

Professor SAUNDERS.—In the bulletin just issued I have referred to the question of the origin of Fife wheats; and as far as I have been able to ascertain, they have all originated from the one sample of Fife, which was called after Mr. Fife. He lived in the township of Otonabee, and the facts I have given are taken from the *Canadian Agriculturist* of 1861, where an account is given of the origin of this wheat. It seems that all the varieties named, known as Fife and Scotch Fife, have originated from this one sample.

Mr. TEMPLE.—I planted that wheat one year in New Brunswick. I had 800 bushels, and it was a very good wheat.

Professor SAUNDERS.—The Fife has been a wheat remarkably free from rust from the outset. It has also been a wheat that has been characterized by unusual vigor

and productiveness; but still, there is no doubt that all these wheats run out in time, and it is therefore very important that we should look out for new varieties long enough ahead to enable the farmers to get new seed when required. At the same time, this wheat has been grown for at least twenty or thirty years with very little evidence of running out where the conditions have been favorable. On the Central Experimental Farm we find that the crop of Red Fife has not been as good as White Fife or Ladoga; it has not yielded as much on the same area of land. The conditions of last season were not as favorable as usual; we had a great drouth during the growing period, which had the effect of lessening the yield very much in this part of Ontario ranging from Ottawa to Kingston. In the Maritime Provinces, however, as well as in the northern part of Ontario, there was a sufficient rainfall.

Before I leave the subject of wheat I would like to call the attention of members to another very important point in connection with the work carried on at the Farm this year, and that is, in testing the vitality of frozen wheat as well as determining the vitality of samples of grain from all parts of the Dominion. The number of tests which have been undertaken up to this date since the season is 913. Of these there have been 216 tests of frozen wheat, of which 186 came from Manitoba, 29 from the North-West Territories and 1 from Quebec. There have been 20 tests of frozen oats, also, all of which were from Manitoba. There were also 19 tests of frozen barley—17 from Manitoba and 2 from the North-West. The frozen wheat has varied in its germinating powers from 21 per cent. to 99 per cent., the highest in germinating power coming from Manitoba, 99 per cent., and the lowest also from Manitoba, 21 per cent. In the North-West Territories the germinating power varied from 29 per cent. to 92 per cent.; frozen barley, 14 per cent. to 99 per cent.; frozen oats from 2 per cent. to 94 per cent. In all these frozen samples the number of plants that produced weak growth were very large, and the difference between the weak and strong plants was very marked.

By Mr. DAVIN:—

Q.—What was the variation in the North-West Territories? A.—From 29 to 92 in the North-West Territories and 21 to 99 in Manitoba. There is one point in testing frozen grain that I desire to call the attention of the committee specially to—that is as to the difference in the growth of the individual plants. The mounted specimen I hold in my hand show plants all of the same age. They are eighteen days from the date of sowing, and you will observe that there is a marked difference in the size of the plants. The two plants which made a strong growth weighed eight and one-third grains, and the two plants of weaker growth weighed two and two-thirds grains, or not quite one-third as much as the stronger plants. Now, the practical point that is involved is this—I wish to draw your special attention to it. A number of people in Manitoba and the North-West have been advocating the use of frozen wheat for seed, and have defended the statements they made in favor of frozen wheat by saying that it will usually germinate well. A badly frozen wheat will sometimes germinate to the extent of 60 or 70 per cent., and twenty-five or thirty plants may make fairly good growth, but the remainder will make only stunted growth. Grain thus injured in its constitution rarely produces good results, and it is just as unwise for a farmer to use a seed grain of that character as it would be for him to select the culls and scrubs of animals with poor constitutions, stunted and deformed, and attempt to get a good herd of cattle from them. No one would think of adopting such a course, and I think it a most unwise thing for any farmer to sow anything but good seed, unless he is driven to it by absolute necessity. The stunted plants will sometimes, in the fertile soils of Manitoba and the North-West, after a week or ten days of comparative rest, make a start and produce a crop, but the result is an uneven ripening of the grain, a part of the crop coming in eight or ten days after the other, a matter of inconvenience and loss to the farmer. These are points which do not seem to have been brought out in the discussion in regard to the value of frozen grain for seed, and they need to be set very fairly before the farmers. This other mounted sample is from frozen barley. There the small plants weighed just

half as much as the strong plants, all sowed at the same time and under the same conditions.

Mr. HESSON.—Is the seed from one ear?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—The samples of frozen grain come in little parcels, and 100 grains are counted out without selection. This shows the result. In the returns we make to parties who send the samples we give them the proportion that will grow, as well as the number of strong and weak plants, and call their attention to the fact that where the weakly plants predominate the chances are they will have an irregular crop, a part of the grain ripening early and a part of it very late, and if the season is unfavorable the crop is likely to be more or less of a failure. All these samples are from frozen grain. When an ear of wheat is ripening the lower grains are those first formed, and by the time those in the upper part of the ear are formed the lower ones are partially matured. These stronger plants have been grown, in all probability, from the best ripened part of the ear in each case.

Mr. PERLEY.—Is that the way they grow from the samples sown?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—It is a fair representation of the proportion of the weakly and strong plants.

Mr. PERLEY.—Is that the result of the whole sample sown?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—There are 100 grains sown in each case, and this is a fair sample of the growth. The variations are very great. Sometimes a sample will yield 60 or 70 per cent. of plants of strong growth, and such grain could be used for seed with comparative safety. In other cases the proportion of weak plants will be one-half to two-thirds of the whole. Such grain is so far injured that it is undesirable to attempt to use it for seed.

Mr. WATSON.—Have you retained samples of the wheat produced?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—We have retained samples of them all, but I did not bring with me samples of frozen grain.

Passing now to the subject of barley, the present condition of the barley trade in Canada does not seem to be in that satisfactory condition which it is desirable it should occupy. I see that exports of barley for the year 1887 were 9,437,717 bushels, valued at \$5,245,968. Nearly the whole of this barley found its way to the United States, as they are the principal customers we have for the kind of barley now being grown. This barley, as you all know, is used chiefly for malting purposes. The American maltsters have been in the habit of using 6-rowed barley for a long period, and prefer it. The English maltsters require and import annually into England about 35,000,000 of bushels, and they only use the 2-rowed barley. The two varieties of barley do not malt together: the one will complete its growth and be ready to be put on the drying kiln thirty-six hours before the other is ready; hence it is very important, if a good price is to be had for the barley, that the two varieties be kept unmixed. If they are mixed the maltsters detect it very quickly, and the barley is only useful then for feed purposes. It is a very important thing, especially for Ontario, that we should try and find additional markets for the barley we raise. The crop in the past few years, from late reports from the Board of Trade in Toronto, appears has been light; still there is a large quantity yet held by the farmers, and the prices are so low at the present time that the prospects are not sufficiently good to induce the farmers to bring it to market. Although the United States maltsters have used, within the last two years, a great deal more barley than before, the supply has been increased in their own country, especially in the western States, and it seems very probable that the United States will be able to grow barley quite sufficient for home consumption within a very short time. If this is the case, Canadian barley will have to find a market elsewhere. The duty of 10 cents per bushel imposed by the United States gives the United States farmer the advantage over the Canadian farmer in this particular, and it is an important

point that our farmers should endeavor to grow such varieties of this useful grain as will command the highest prices and enable them to ship the surplus across the water. The first point necessary is to ascertain where this barley can be best grown, and the next what variety of barley would produce in this country the best results. There are samples here of barley, such as have been and are still being distributed for test. This is a sample of the original importation of the variety known as the "Peerless White." This is Daniel Chevalier's barley, grown in Manitoba. These samples that I am submitting weigh from 53 to 54 lbs. per bushel, and will suit the English market very well and command good prices. Last year we sent out—speaking from memory—about 240 samples of barley to be tested in different points of the Dominion; 164 of these samples were of the 2-rowed varieties, 95 of them Danish barley, and the reports which we have received in regard to these barleys have all been favorable. In Ontario the average yield from 2-lb. samples has been 53 lbs.; in Quebec 52 lbs.; in Manitoba 52 lbs.; in Nova Scotia 47 lbs.—showing a very uniform yield. Of the "Peerless White," which is another variety that I have here, 43 samples were sent out, and the average yield was: in Nova Scotia 63 lbs.; in Ontario 85 lbs.; indicating that it was a more productive barley than the Danish barley, although in the samples grown on the Central Farm in field plots I could not discover any marked difference in the fertility of the two. These barleys have also been tested as single plants, grown in the way I have described when speaking of the wheat, and the product has averaged, taking a selected plant from each lot, as in the case of wheat, 798 fold. Barley is also grown in many districts of this country for feed; hence, some attention has been devoted to the growing of feed barleys. One of the varieties tested is large, 2-rowed, naked barley. It is a very handsome barley, and weighs about 56 lbs. to the bushel. This is a sample of the ear. It threshes out much the same as wheat, quite clear from husk. Another of the feed barleys we have tested is known as the 6-rowed wheat barley. It is a smaller grain than the large 2-rowed, and seems to be a useful sort. Experiments have been tried with mensury barley, showing that it is a good variety for feeding, also the 2-rowed black. Both of these have yielded well. Further experiments will be tried with these barleys on a larger scale. It has not always been easy to get a sufficient quantity of seed of some of these varieties at the outset, in order to distribute them; but enough has been grown during the past year to enable us to send a small supply of seed to each of the Experimental Farms, so that the usefulness of these barleys for feed purposes will be ascertained at several points this year. None of these barleys are useful for malting purposes. I have received, during the winter, a seedling barley from Mr. J. Baxter, of Pickering, Ont., who tells me it is a 6-rowed barley, which weighs 56 lbs. to the bushel. Some of you might wish to look at this barley; I will read to you what Mr. Baxter says about its character and origin. He says: "I have a small quantity of new barley (or improved 6-rowed). It is a short, thick kernel, weighs 56 lbs. to the bushel, and is about ten days earlier than our common 6-rowed. Good straw. This barley originated with me four years ago from one grain. With three years' sowing I have a bushel and a-half. Will send you one pound, if you would care to try it. Think it would be a good barley for the North-West, as it comes early."

Mr. SEMPLE.—Have you samples of winter barley?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—I have not with me. We sowed some last autumn, but I cannot say what the result will be, as the climate, on account of its severity here, is not very favorable for winter barley. I have seen some very good samples in British Columbia which yielded a heavy crop.

Mr. SEMPLE.—Would it malt with 2-rowed?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—The barley I have seen has all been 6-rowed; but if it can be grown to weigh 56 lbs. to the bushel it will probably malt with 2-rowed, because the difference in malting is not due, I believe, to any difference in the character of the grain, but to the fact that the 2-rowed is thicker and plumper. When the grain is put into what the maltsters call the steep it takes a considerable

time for the water to soak through it. It is left there until the maltster can rub the grain to a pulp between his thumb and finger, and it will take a longer time to reach this condition with a thick, plump grain than with that which is thin and has comparatively little substance. If 6-rowed barley can be grown of the desired weight and plumpness, in all probability it will malt with the 2-rowed varieties, although that is an opinion that will require the test of experience.

Mr. COCHRANE.—What is the number of days of difference in ripening of this new seedling barley?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—I have had no experience with this barley yet—the grower says it is about ten days earlier than our common 6-rowed barley. I wish to say here, with regard to the cultivation of common 6-rowed barley and common oats, there is a great lack of information in the farming community with regard to the varieties of oats and barley grown. Almost every man who grows potatoes can tell you the name of the potato he grows, but he can seldom tell you the names of the barley and oats he is growing; he knows them as common oats or common barley. Now, there is an individuality just as distinct about these different varieties of barley and oats as between different classes of stock and other animals, and it is important that we have accurate information in regard to the varieties of grains that are being grown, and I believe the Experimental Farms are awakening an interest in this subject among the farmers everywhere in Canada. From correspondence within the last few weeks, I find that there is a general desire on the part of the farmers to do what they can to contribute to the progress of the country, by bringing new sorts of grain, with which they have had experience, under the notice of the Experimental Farms, and endeavoring to have them tested and carefully reported on.

Mr. WATSON.—Do you know if there is any difference between the relative values for malting purposes of the barley grown in Manitoba and Ontario?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—I have only one sample here from Manitoba, which was grown by Mr. Bedson, of Stoney Mountain, and that seems to me to be almost, if not quite, as good as the original importation from England. We had three or four samples of the better barleys grown on the Experimental Farm at Indian Head. Two of them weighed 54 lbs. to the bushel and one 53 lbs. to the bushel.

Mr. DAVIN.—Have you any samples from the Territories. This is a —

Prof. SAUNDERS.—Yes; this is a sample from Indian Head, and barleys of this weight and quality will find a ready sale in the English market at good prices.

Mr. COCHRANE.—Is this 6-rowed?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—That is 2-rowed.

Mr. COCHRANE.—How do the 2-rowed and the 6-rowed compare with the other. It is the impression among the farmers that the 2-rowed barleys give as great or greater yield than the 6-rowed.

Prof. SAUNDERS.—There is a difference of opinion among the farmers in this respect. A gentleman who has a farm within twenty miles of Ottawa called on me a few weeks ago, and speaking about barley, he said: "I grow 2-rowed barley altogether; I don't grow any 6-rowed." I said: "How is that, can you get good prices for it?" And he said: "No; it is rated as third-class, and there seems at present to be no special demand for it; but I use my barley principally for feed, and I can grow so much more on my land that it pays a good deal better to grow 2-rowed barley than 6-rowed."

Mr. COCHRANE.—He did not say what kind of land it was.

Prof. SAUNDERS.—No, sir; though all these many different varieties of barley have been grown during the past season on the Experimental Farm in field plots and as single plants, the results of which I hope to get into shape and publish in the form of a bulletin as soon as the information can be compiled. In continuing the

distribution of barley we have this season sent out, up to the present time, 409 samples of the 2-rowed barleys to different points in the Dominion, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia. We endeavor to make the distribution as equally as possible over the different Provinces; 731 different samples of wheat have also been sent out in 3-lb. bags from the Experimental Farm within the last few weeks. We have also distributed 412 bags, holding one and a-half pounds each, of walnuts, and 111 of butternuts, and some other sorts of tree seeds, with a view of testing them in the different parts of the Dominion. The black walnut and the butternut tree will be tried only in localities where it does not grow naturally. The samples of barley which we are sending out are, as I think, the best obtainable, except, perhaps, the Talle barley, some of which was ordered last November, but has not arrived yet. All the varieties referred to will be tested at the Experimental Farms in the several Provinces.

Tests with oats have also been carried on, reference to which you will find in the appendix to the report of the Minister. The number of the varieties tried is eighty. They have been grown in field plots and also as single plants, and the average production from a single grain, taking a selected plant from each of these plots, has been 1,458 fold. Some varieties have gone as high as 3,000 fold, and some as low as 300, showing that there is inherent in these different varieties varying degrees of power in the way of fertility. This important point of relative fertility is one on which too much stress cannot be laid, when regard is had to the importance of the cultivation of these several cereals in this country. The distribution of oats last year was chiefly of the variety known as the Welcome, a very good variety, but one which had not found its way into many parts of the Dominion. There was a limited distribution made of this. The average yield, from the distribution last year, from the 2 lbs., was 45 in Ontario, 60 in Nova Scotia, 27 in Quebec and 57 in New Brunswick. The yield of the Early Race Horse—a variety of which we were able to send out only a very few samples—was 105 in Ontario and 52 in Quebec, from the 2 lbs. sent out. The Early Blossom was sent out only in one or two cases to Quebec, and the average yield there was 30 lbs.

Mr. WATSON.—Were none of these varieties of oats sent to Manitoba?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—I think not. There were only a few samples sent out, and I do not think any of those were sent to Manitoba. We have a considerable quantity this year, and are sending them out freely. We have also obtained from James Carter & Co., London, England, samples of Carter's Prize Cluster oats. Some 200 or 300 samples have been sent out, and we have endeavored to scatter them all over the country, so that they can be grown under all the different conditions of climate and soil in the Dominion. This variety weighs $45\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. to the bushel, and is said to be one of the earliest sorts grown.

Mr. JONES (Digby).—What did you say the yield was in Ontario of the variety you have just referred to?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—The Early Race Horse I said was 105 lbs., and the yield of Welcome oats in Ontario was 45 lbs. I would not like the committee to take these figures as at all reliable for a large number of tests. There were very few tests made; and, as you know, last season in some parts of the Province was very unfavorable for all cereals, and especially so in central Ontario. It requires a greater number of tests before we can say that the Early Race Horse is a more productive variety than the Welcome. Results of these will be published with the results of all the varieties grown as single grains under similar conditions, and this information will aid in the solution of the question of relative productiveness.

Q.—Where is that Prize Cluster oats from? A.—From James Carter & Co., seedsmen, of London, England. It is a variety they have lately sent out. Another part of the work at the Experimental Farm has been to carry on a series of tests of the different varieties of corn as to their value for ensilage purposes. This is a question which is agitating the minds of the farmers all over the Dominion, especially

in the eastern and central Provinces. Between sixty and seventy varieties of corn have been tested, but on account of the stock of seeds being very much delayed in transit the corn had to be sown two weeks later than it would have been, and hence the results have not been as reliable as if the corn had been planted at the proper time. We have these different varieties on hand for this year's seeding, and expect to be able to get results that will be generally useful as to the value of the individual varieties, also as to the distance at which kernels shall be planted from each other, the spaces between the rows, and other points in connection with the cultivation of this useful crop for ensilage purposes. In connection with corn, I might say that tests are also being made with different fertilizers. Sixteen plots have been selected, with one-tenth of an acre each, where the same varieties will be grown from year to year, with a special fertilizer in each case, leaving one or two unmanured plots among them for comparison.

Mr. ROBERTSON.—What are the best kinds of fodder corn?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—That is a question that I am not quite prepared to answer at the present time. I merely give the information we have been able to obtain. As I remarked a few moments ago, the seed of a large number of the varieties of corn which we planted last year did not reach us in time. It was ordered in good season, but the bags went astray, through the carelessness of one of the railways, and did not turn up for nearly a month—two weeks after the time for seeding. The corn was put in, but the season it had was too short.

Mr. McMILLAN.—What variety gave the best results?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—I could only answer that question by referring to my books. We have seventy odd varieties, and as I did not consider that such information as I could now give would be of much value I did not prepare it for the committee. The two classes of corn which are chiefly grown for ensilage are the Dent and the Yellow corns. These are very different as to their period of ripening. The Dent corn produces the largest amount of foliage, and requires a longer season in which to mature. A variety of corn which would do well in Mr. McMillan's section, one of the most famed parts of Ontario, might, if grown in the northern parts of Quebec, northern parts of Ontario, or the Maritime Provinces, not reach that period of development in its growth which would make it of much value for ensilage. In these districts it is very necessary that early ripening sorts should be got, for the reason that the corn plant must have reached a certain stage in its growth before it has stored up in its substance the largest proportion of nutritious matter. When the corn arrives at that stage of its growth when the ears are said to be glazed, the foliage contains in it a very large quantity of saccharine and nutritious matter, laid up there for the maturing and ripening of the seed. If you attempt to grow a late variety in a locality where the season is short the chances are that it will not reach that stage of its development which will insure its containing the largest amount of nutritious matter at the time of cutting. Hence, it would not be wise, in the early period of this experimental work, to express opinions as to the varieties. All the Experimental Farms have been supplied with such sorts of corn as it has been thought desirable to test, and the superintendents have been instructed to sow them at the proper time and keep an account of the results, so that next year we hope to be in a position to give much useful information on this important subject.

The potato has also been a subject of special investigation at the Experimental Farm here. This last year 251 varieties were tested. The weight of seed was noted, and the weight of the crop, as well as the character of the potato when cooked. These points have been carefully gone over, and notes taken regarding them, and that information will be available as soon as it can be compiled; 236 new varieties were also raised from hybridized seed, among which there are some very promising sorts. In several instances tubers have been produced weighing in all over a pound in a single year, and this result has been arrived at without the use of any special manure. • I am hopeful that among these seedlings there may be some useful sorts

which we may be able to send out in the course of two or three years for cultivation in the Dominion.

I have not referred to the question of stock on the Experimental Farm here. As most of you are aware, nothing has yet been done, further than to provide the buildings. These buildings were not completed early enough in the winter to admit of having the animals last year. The barn is a very large one, and in this climate, unless you have a great number of animals to put into a large barn of that character, there is a difficulty of keeping it warm enough, and under such circumstances pure-bred animals would be very liable to colds. It was thought best to defer the purchase of valuable animals until the spring. Further, we have found it difficult during the last year, in common with all the other farmers of this district, to get a considerable catch of grass. We seeded a piece of land with timothy and clover, and the dry weather burned it up to such an extent that it was a failure, but we seeded again in the autumn this year, and we hope to have better success.

Mr. COCHRANE.—Did you seed the same land ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—No, sir ; we seeded that land last referred to with rye in the autumn and will seed another part in the spring.

Mr. COCHRANE.—Did you say that you sowed the clover seed in the fall ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—No, sir ; only the timothy was sown ; the clover we shall sow in the spring. It is expected that stock will be secured this summer, and before the year is out I hope we shall have entered on a series of useful experiments with several of the more important breeds of stock.

The question of forestry, which is a very important one in the North-West Territories and Manitoba—

Mr. COCHRANE.—Before you start on that—have you tried plaster on your seed ? Have you experimented with that ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—No, sir ; we have not used plaster to any extent. The Experimental Farm, you will bear in mind, has only been in operation two seasons, and the first season we had no fences on parts of the farm, and it was difficult to keep the cows out, and last year it was impossible to undertake all we desired to. This coming season it is proposed to try plaster on several crops, and a number of other fertilizers.

Mr. SEMPLE.—Have you experimented by sowing a large quantity or a small quantity to the acre ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—We have experimented with corn in that way, but we have not experimented yet with wheat. That is one of the experiments laid out for the coming season. Is it wheat you refer to ?

Mr. SEMPLE.—Wheat, oats or barley.

Prof. SAUNDERS.—We hope to undertake all these branches of experimental work in time. Our attention has been largely devoted during the past year to accumulating material so as to stock the Experimental Farms of the Dominion, and we will carry on, in subsequent years, all such experiments. It is impossible to reach everything in one season. We have tested up to this time over 200 varieties of cereals, 250 varieties of potatoes, 50 or 60 of corn, besides many other useful crops. Some attention has been paid to fodder plants, and also to forest trees. Much has already been done, and we hope to reach all these useful points as rapidly as possible. I was about to remark that the question of forestry has been gone into very carefully. About three or four hundred varieties of trees and shrubs have been tried on the Experimental Farm here. About 20,000 were sent out to the farm at Indian Head last spring, and we shall have a large consignment ready here this spring, of trees well rooted and prepared for standing the vicissitudes of Manitoba and the North-West climates, to forward as soon as the season will permit. The question of forestry is not only important there, but I think it will be found, before many years, to be

important in all parts of the Dominion, and various plantations are being made on the Central Farm, where the growth of the different sorts of trees will be tested, by taking measurements every year, and in the course of five or ten years the results there will probably be worth inspecting, as it will be shown what these different trees will do in this climate. We hope to have very soon the same in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and when the time comes when that question of forestry becomes a burning question here, the information will be valuable for the farmers and tree-growers as to the best varieties to grow, and what sizes these varieties will obtain under ordinary cultivation in this climate in a given number of years. The importance of forest trees for shelter, as well as for the value of their wood, cannot I think, be over-estimated in all the different Provinces of the Dominion. The shelter that belts of trees afford to crops, as fall wheat, and also the effect of the trees as wind-breaks during the summer, is of the greatest importance. We have grown at Indian Head during the last year nearly 50,000 Manitoba maple trees from seed and are planting out avenues and shelter belts there, so as to set the people a good example. The farmers of Manitoba and the North-West have so much push that it is only necessary to show them examples of good tree-growth to set them all to work, and the number of requests we have had for tree-seed from those parts is sufficient to show that all that is necessary to start tree-planting generally is to determine that it can be done successfully. When that has been accomplished we will have plenty of imitators throughout the country.

By Mr. DAVIN:—

Q.—Is it too soon to look for the solution of any forestal question at the Indian Head Farm? I saw, something like a year ago, myriads of trees planted there, and I would like to know if there has been any reports as to any of the varieties having failed? A.—They were planted last spring, and the superintendent reports to me, a few days ago, that as far as he can judge from examination most of the young trees have come through the winter very well. He has also been experimenting with some eight or ten varieties of fall wheat, and says that they have come through very well, as far as he can judge, and will do well, unless some unfavorable weather should injure them after this.

By Dr. SPROULE:—

Q.—Have you tested the germinating power of timothy seed threshed with a machine? A.—Yes; we have tested that on several different occasions and reported on it. We found that timothy seed threshed in that way was just about as good in its germinating power as that threshed in the usual way. It did not vary in its germinating power to any extent worth speaking of.

By Mr. WATSON:—

Q.—I see you have samples of flour and bread, which you have forgotten to refer to? A.—Yes; the Ladoga wheat question has been fully set forth in the bulletin in your hands, but I wish to call your attention again to some samples of this variety of grain which has been graded as soft wheat by the Toronto Board of Trade, as hard wheat by the Montreal Board of Trade, and extra hard by Mr. W. W. Ogilvy. This is a sample of Ladoga wheat grown at Touchwood Hills, and the grading you will find fully set forth in the bulletin I have referred to. There is the sample marked No. 12, which was graded as hard wheat by the Montreal Board of Trade, as soft wheat by the Toronto Board of Trade, and as extra No. 1 hard by Mr. W. W. Ogilvy. Mr. Ogilvy gave his personal attention to the grading of this wheat.

By Mr. GORDON:—

Q.—I see that you have some reports from British Columbia as to this wheat. What points were they from? A.—Some from the Spillamachine district, one from Ashcroft, and another from a district I cannot recollect. They are all on the mainland. Here is also a sample from Mr. Henry King, of Victoria, of Ladoga wheat

grown there. It is interesting to know that it became soft on Vancouver Island, although grown from the same seed as was sown in the North-West. It is not equal in quality to the grain produced in the North-West.

Mr. WATSON.—It becomes hard in Manitoba ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—Yes. This is a sample of the bread from the Ladoga wheat. These are two samples of the flour, and I would be glad if some one would pass these around among the members of the committee. This is made from Ladoga wheat grown on the Indian Head Farm, and which weighed sixty-two pounds to the bushel. The other is from Red Fife wheat, grown on an adjoining farm, which averaged forty bushels to the acre, and was graded No. 1 hard. Twenty bushels of each variety were taken to the Qu'Appelle mills and the flour manufactured from each, and I think the comparison will be in every way a fair one. You will see that the Red Fife is whiter in color than the Ladoga.

Mr. WATSON.—I think the great question is as to the quantity of bread you will have in 100 pounds of flour.

Prof. SAUNDERS.—The Ladoga will give about two pounds more of bread to the 100 pounds of flour. I need not say very much about the Indian wheats we have received, for the reason that there is a very full account of these in the appendix to the report of the Minister, which has been in the hands of the members for the last two or three weeks.

Dr. ROOME.—Have you been experimenting with fall wheat ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—Yes; we have imported five or six of the new varieties of fall wheat, which we are testing on a moderately large scale this winter. I went over them the other day, and some of them seem to have come through fairly well, while others appear to have suffered considerably during the winter.

Mr. COCHRANE.—Will the hard Red Fife wheat of Manitoba produce the same sample of wheat in Ontario. Have you tested that ?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—You will find in Bulletin 4 one instance where a test has been made of Red Fife being grown in Ontario from Manitoba seed, and it shows a slight falling off in the first year in the proportion of gluten contained in the wheat. I think I didn't fully answer your question in regard to Indian wheats. There are among these Indian wheats several varieties which are moderately hard. It is not proposed to send out to any person for testing any wheats about which there is any question as to whether they are hard or not in the North-West Territories. We test these wheats at the different Experimental Farms first, so as to ascertain whether they will harden, and if they prove to reach the desired quality they will be more extensively tried, and we may then be able to bring seed to Ontario, Quebec and other Provinces, improved in its character and quality. It will also be grown here at the same time, to find out what its real value is to the Ontario farmer. I think it is important that we should look after the soft wheats for Ontario as well as hard wheats for the North-West, for the reason that the crop grown in Ontario has been, up to the present time, much larger than the crop grown in the North-West, and the quantity available for export has been larger here than there. Looking, however, to the future of the country, there is no doubt that the principal part of the wheat of the country will be grown in the North-West Territories and Manitoba, and it is very important, in the interests of the whole Dominion, that that great question of wheat growing should be thoroughly investigated and the most reliable information available obtained and disseminated.

By Mr. McNEILL :—

Q.—Can you tell me, in regard to frozen wheat, whether you can form any reliable opinion, from its appearance, as to whether it will produce many or few wheat plants? A.—I do not think that practicable. If you have a very good

sample or a very poor one to deal with an approximately correct opinion may be given. The grading of frozen wheats I have not found to be uniform. I had a sample lately sent me from the Rat Portage mills of frozen wheat graded Nos. 1, 2 and 3. The No. 3 frozen germinated better than No. 2, showing there was no value in that grading, but the No. 1 was better than either the No. 2 or 3. I think it is very difficult for any farmer to tell, by the look of a sample of frozen wheat, whether it is going to be useful for seed or not.

Q.—Is that naked barley you spoke of productive? A.—Yes; it is very productive barley.

Q.—You spoke of the Welcome and Race Horse oats, and the yield for these two varieties. Were those oats sent to the same farmers together, and was it from the same farmers that the returns were received? A.—They were sent from different parts. The endeavor was made to scatter the samples over as large an area as possible.

Q.—Did you not think it wise to send these two varieties to the same farmers so as to get some more reliable data as to the yield? A.—We have done that whenever it has been possible, and we are doing it at the different Experimental Farms, but there are so many applications for samples of grain for tests that it is not easy to send three or four samples to each farmer. If that plan were adopted we should use up all our samples in a very short time and they would not cover the ground as well.

By Dr. ROBERTSON:—

Q.—Did the Ladoga wheat seem to lose its hard character in the Maritime Provinces? A.—I have samples of this wheat from all over the four Eastern Provinces. Here is one from Prince Edward Island which you will be interested to see. It is from Mr. Campbell. There does not seem to be any material falling off in hardness in this wheat which Mr. Campbell has sent.

Q.—I am glad to hear that, as it is of very great importance to us. A.—Here are samples also from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec.

By Mr. COCHRANE:—

Q.—What is the best time to cut corn? A.—About the time when the corn is in the ear, and in that condition which is called the glazed state.

By Mr. McNEILL:—

Q.—Is it when the corn would be in the milky state, as it were? A.—When the substance of the corn is in a soft condition, before it reaches the starchy state, when the nutriment has been taken from the foliage and stored up in the grain.

By Mr. COCHRANE:—

Q.—Have you any rule for forming an opinion as to the condition of the corn when it is sown so thickly that you cannot see in? A.—You should not sow it so thickly. It is not so good for ensilage.

Q.—But if it were sown so thickly that you could not examine the ears, what then? A.—I think you ought to give as long a season as possible. Corn requires as much sunshine as possible, and it is quite a mistake to sow it thickly.

Q.—What do you call thick? A.—I have known some farmers to sow two or three bushels to the acre. I think it should not much exceed half a bushel to the acre, and it should be sown in rows 3 to 3½ feet apart, and the plants from 4 to 6 inches apart in the row. This is quite thick enough for ensilage, and a heavier crop can be grown in this way than if sown thickly.

By Mr. McMILLAN (Huron):—

Q.—I believe that this question is of more importance in Ontario to-day than the wheat question. If there is a variety of two or three that are better than the others they should be made known as early as possible. I would suggest, in this respect,

when the report comes out the reports of the different farmers and their experiments be given, and that it be embodied in the report of the Minister of Agriculture, with reports on wheat, potatoes and other products. A.—To accomplish this work so early in the year would require a larger staff than we now have and an increased vote in the Estimates. The experiments in cereals alone have involved 600 separate threshings, and this requires much time to accomplish, and with all the other details required, concerning all the tests made at the several farms, I fear it would be impossible to get that information ready in time for the annual report.

Q.—With respect to the corn, there is not so much labor in corn as other grain?

A.—I understood you to say that you thought all these results should be worked up for the annual report.

Q.—With respect to potatoes, have you experimented with the different varieties or the different manner of planting whole potatoes of the same variety, cutting them, planting small potatoes whole. My attention was drawn to this subject last year at a Farmers' Institute meeting in Ontario. A very large quantity of the potatoes for this last two years never came up. There were large blanks in the different fields. Mr. Rennie, at Toronto, who was at the Farmers' Institute, said that a great deal of that was owing to the time the potatoes were planted; that he had never, for many years, planted his potatoes on a hot, sunny day, in the heat of the day, and some of the farmers laughed at the idea. One farmer has three sons, and when they heard of it they tried the experiment last spring. On the 24th of May they went out on their land and put in four drills in the morning and covered them right up; and four drills which they did not cover until the afternoon. From the morning drills they took out sixteen and a-half bags of potatoes, and of that not covered until the afternoon they took out four and a-half bags. In the latter case the potatoes were left on a hot summer day from 8 o'clock in the morning until the afternoon before they were covered, and this goes to show that great care must be taken in all the experiments that we make. That was the result of that experiment, which, however, would need to be tested. I know of another experiment made with the Late Rose potatoes, with the potatoes planted whole, planted 9 inches apart, and from a certain length of drill there were 86 lbs. The same potatoes were cut in two, gave 46 lbs., and potatoes cut with two eyes, I think there were 45 lbs., and fresh cut potatoes of the same variety only gave 40 lbs., under the same conditions. A.—I would say that we have tried some of these experiments. That experiment of leaving the cut potatoes in the rows for a day or a part of a day in the heat of the sun has been tried at several of the Experimental Stations in the United States, and always with somewhat such results as you have reported. Experiments have been tried with Early Rose, growing them from single eyes, two eyes and selected large potatoes. They have also been grown from potato pairings, leaving the eye uninjured in the peeling, and good potatoes have been grown from those. One of our men, a workman imbued with an experimental spirit, took some White Elephant potatoes, cut out all the eyes, and got some eyes of these Early Rose and stuck them into the White Elephant potatoes. When I was going my round one day I saw a label stuck up by some growing potatoes with "Pilkey's Twins" on it. On enquiry I was told that these were Pilkeys, in which he had grafted the eye of the Early Rose into the White Elephant. We have the result of that experiment. It produces quite a nice lot of potatoes, which partake more after the Early Rose than the White Elephant.

By Mr. DAVIN:—

Q.—I should like to ask you whether, in your opinion, that Judket wheat would grade as No. 1 hard? A.—After the experience I have given in my bulletin I would not like to grade any wheat. If there is such a difference of opinion between men who have spent a lifetime in grading wheat it would not become me as an amateur to pass an opinion. I think it would be better for Mr. Watson to speak of it.

Q.—Mr. Watson thinks it would grade No. 1 hard? A.—I went to the barn where that wheat lay, and it showed a production of 30 to 35 bushels to the acre, and

you could not find a single grain frozen. That was at Moose Jaw. I would like to make this statement because my friend (Mr. Watson) inadvertently stated that all the grain in the North-West has been more or less frozen. As a fact, all west of a certain point in the North-West utterly escaped being frozen.

By Dr. SPROULE:—

Q.—What time did you plant the corn last year? You said two or three weeks late? A.—The corn was planted on the 14th of June, and the 1st of June we consider here is late enough for us to plant corn.

By Mr. COCHRANE:—

Q.—Did you have any of the corn stalks analyzed to see what the feeding quality was at the different stages? A.—No; for the reason that our laboratory is not quite completed.

Q.—Why, then, are you so positive about the feeding quality at a certain stage? A.—Because a number of such analyses have been made at other points. A recent report has been published by the Experimental Station in connection with the Cornell University, at Ithaca, N. Y., in which it is shown that corn gains in its nutritive powers in a very marvellous manner in three or four weeks after it reaches a certain stage in its growth. Up to a certain period it is comparatively poor in its nutritive properties, while it gains them very rapidly until it reaches this stage which I have described. When it reaches that stage it has stored up in its substance the largest amount of nutriment that can be found in it at any period of its growth.

Q.—How would that make a difference? For instance, if you put corn in for ensilage or feeding purposes—soiling purposes—and grow a large stalk, if it were cut for ensilage it would become just as nutritious for the cattle which masticated it. Would it not be as good for the cattle? A.—If you attempt to feed corn before it has reached that condition of which I was speaking you will get very poor results, because the nutrition is not in it. It is the sunlight which has the most to do with developing these nutritious elements during the growth of the corn, and for this reason it is very undesirable that it should be sown so thickly that the sunlight cannot reach it freely.

By Mr. SPROULE:—

Q.—Have you endeavored to find out whether there was anything in the idea of sowing it in drills, north and south, or sowing it east and west? A.—We have not made that test. We sowed north and south, because we found it most convenient on our land to do so. There has been attention paid in Europe to that particular class of tests, and the evidence seems to point to the importance of sowing these varieties of grains where they are sown in rows, north and south, which gives free access of light and air to the growing plant. This applies also to barley, wheat and other grains sown in drills.

By Mr. McMILLAN:—

Q.—He says one of the men took the experimental mania. Is there a man on the farm under whom the experiments are carried on, or does each man carry them on himself? A.—I exercise general superintendence over them all, but the farm foreman is in special charge of the experiments with grain and potatoes and other field crops. The ordinary farm laborers do not, as a rule, take a particular interest in anything that is going on beyond what they are told to look after, but the man was an exception to the general rule, and being surrounded by experiments he thought he would try one for himself.

Q.—It is impossible for Prof. Saunders himself, with the large amount of labor he must have to perform, to supervise all these experiments properly, and there should be a thoroughly practical man at the head of the experimental part of the farm—a man thoroughly posted in all the departments of agriculture—to see that all these experiments are properly carried on; there should be a man to get his

instructions from the Professor and see that they are properly carried out. A.—We have endeavored to do that as far as possible. It is a difficult thing to find a man possessing all the qualifications mentioned by Mr. McMillan. If one could find such an individual, who would combine all these good points, he would be worth a great deal. We have a very good man in our farm foreman, who is very careful and very reliable. I have some other good men in connection with the work of grain testing. One of these is a young man who is present with me at this moment. He has done a great deal in the way of working up experimental results, looking after the threshing of these various grains and doing other work for the different Experimental Farms. I have endeavored to check the work as far as it is possible to do so. At this early stage in the history of the Farm, it has been impossible to reach perfection in the arrangements, but I hope I will get somewhere near it in time.

Q.—I defy the member for Perth to show a single instance of my finding fault with the salary of any individual in the Government service, but I believe that special individuals, who are perfectly adapted for it, should have charge of all the work.

By Mr. WATSON :—

Q.—Has your analyst made a comparison of the quality of the gluten contained in the different varieties of wheat? A.—That question I have incidentally referred to in my report. There has not been any chemical test yet devised for ascertaining the comparative quality of gluten. Chemists have recognized that there are differences in its physical characteristics, such as elasticity, etc., but no satisfactory chemical test has yet been found for arriving at that quality which is so much prized by bakers and millers. Hence, the chemical tests are not wholly reliable for that reason. I think that will partly explain why it is that such varieties of wheat as Kubanka, although found to contain a fair proportion of gluten, are not desirable for making high-class baking flour. There has been an instrument devised lately which we are about to get from Europe, a sort of mechanical test for the quality of gluten, which I think will give us some help in this matter; but it only applies where the flour can be had, and a great many samples of wheat are grown in small quantities only. It is not always easy to get the flour. For this reason the instrument referred to will have but a limited use; as far, however, as its use goes, it will be valuable in determining a question which is one of considerable importance in connection with this subject.

Q.—I see that Red Fife is reported as containing less gluten than the Ladoga? A.—In one test it contains a trifle more, but that is a crude test.

Q.—You made the statement that a given quantity of flour made a larger quantity of bread? A.—That is the Ladoga—yes. You will find, under the head of "Chemical Analyses," page 23 of the bulletin in question, that the chemist says: "The average proportion of albuminoids (a term held as synonymous with gluten) in eleven samples of Ladoga is 14.31, while that from the six samples of Red Fife is 14.00. But if the comparison is restricted to the samples of Ladoga and Red Fife grown in Manitoba and the North-West Territories the proportion would be as follows: Ladoga, 14.57; Red Fife, 13.98—an appreciable difference in favor of the Ladoga variety." The gluten in the Ladoga is equal in every respect, I think, to the gluten in the Red Fife. I have reason to believe that from several mechanical tests I have applied in working it up with water, and from the reports of bakers and millers, both of whom state positively that the Ladoga flour is the stronger flour of the two. These reports were given independently, and I think they are fair in every particular, as no one expert has known that any other expert was reporting on the wheat.

By Dr. MACDONALD :—

Q.—Where was this bread made? Was it made here? A.—Yes; at my house—made under my own supervision and under exactly similar conditions.

By Mr. SEMPLE:—

Q.—The questions I wished to ask were: can you give the committee the yield per acre of wheat and barley grown on the Experimental Farm? A.—I have a list here of the yield of every variety from single grains grown a foot apart, but I do not think the yield from small plots of grain can be given by me with anything like a certainty, for several reasons. In the first place, in cutting we have to be very careful; we always leave a few of the plants on the outside rows, for fear that in sowing they might have been mixed. If a sheaf of any variety is dropped on the way to the barn it goes in with the mixed grain, and then in threshing the first two or three quarts are thrown in the mixed grains. These points interfere seriously with the result of small plots of grains.

Q.—Can you give a single area which would be more satisfactory than single plots? A.—That is what we are attempting to do this coming year, not only on this farm, but on other farms—to sow acre plots and two-acre plots of each variety.

Q.—Have you sown any Red Fife and Red Fern on the farm? A.—Yes; I have both Red Fife and Red Fern. I made up the figures the other evening of the comparative yield of the Red Fife, Ladoga and White Russian, and I am speaking from memory when I say that the Red Fife was between 12 and 13 bushels, the Ladoga was 16 bushels, and the White Russian was 16½ bushels per acre, grown under similar conditions. This year the land will be in better condition and we expect better results. The wheat last year was more or less shrunken with dry weather.

Q.—I had reference to Red Fern wheat? A.—I could get you the particulars of the yield of Red Fern, but they are not filled up yet.

Q.—It is the Fife wheat in the section where I live. I haven't seen it for more than two years. It yields well and makes good flour. It averages about 20 bushels to the acre? A.—I think that was probably a fair yield.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is the Red Fern a soft wheat?

Prof. SAUNDERS.—No, sir; it is a hard wheat.

By Mr. SEMPLE:—

Q.—It is the hard wheat in the section I come from.

By Mr. COCHRANE:—

Q.—Are you experimenting in fall wheat? A.—Yes, sir; we have eight or ten large plots of fall wheat, and a hundred varieties were planted in small plots as single plants. As far as I am able to judge, some of the varieties have come through the winter fairly well. We did grow some fall wheat last year, but not much. One or two varieties last year did not come through the winter very well, but some others were fairly productive.

By Dr. ROOME:—

Q.—Where did you get these samples of fall wheat? A.—Mostly from England; from Oakshott and Millard, of Reading, and from Carter's, and from Mr. Mold, who employs most of his time in selecting wheat to be used as seed. He calls these selected samples ennobled wheats. These three parties we have got most of our samples from.

Q.—Could you get fall wheat from a colder climate than this? A.—I don't know that we could.

By Mr. CARPENTER:—

Q.—For ensilage purposes you recommend that we plant corn in a certain way. Now, for soiling purposes, and for feeding purposes during the months of August and September, don't you think it would be better to put it in thickly—say, three or four bushels to the acre. The object in growing corn in that way is to get a great quantity, but you do not think we would get as great a quantity from putting it in thickly as thinly? A.—Corn has not that nutriment in it which you desire until it

reaches a certain stage, and if you cut it before that you have poor feed. I think it would be better to sow something else for soiling purposes—some mixture of peas or tares with oats and barley, or something of that kind, such as is grown in the Maritime Provinces, and not cut your corn until it would be sure to have the proper qualities in it which make it valuable.

Q.—I have used peas largely for soiling purposes, and with good results. I found that cows would produce more milk from peas than from corn? A.—There are some varieties of winter rye that are very useful for feeding.

Mr. FISHER.—I may say that a good deal of experimenting has been done in my neighborhood, and the universal testimony is that corn must be sown thin for soiling purposes, and if it was necessary to cut it before it reaches that stage which Prof. Saunders referred to it may have great weight, but the value is such that it does not make good feed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 10th April, 1889.

The Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 10.30 a.m., Mr. White (Renfrew), presiding. A number of gentlemen were present representing the Dominion Dairymen's Association. On motion, it was agreed that they should be heard.

D. A. MACPHERSON, President, spoke as follows:—

We are glad to meet your honorable committee for the purpose of presenting before you some claims, which we hope will receive your careful consideration and justice. We have met here, at the solicitation of a gentleman, for the purpose of considering and extending the welfare of the dairy business of this country. A meeting was called, and we are proud to find that a number of gentlemen have answered to the call. An association was formed yesterday after due consideration. After getting the sentiments of the delegates from the different Provinces of this country we found there was a unanimous desire that a Dominion Dairymen's Association should be formed, and it was believed that a great and lasting good would be extended to the dairymen of the different Provinces by this association. In presenting before you a few brief points, which, no doubt, will be of some interest to you, I shall strive to be as brief as possible, and to the point. The history of dairying, particularly of cheese, dates back for about twenty-five years. At that time the farmers of this country were depending largely on the products of the soil—the direct sale of the products of the soil in the form of grain—for money. At that time it was found that by selling grain from the original fertile soil that the land was gradually deteriorating in value, and that the profits were gradually being reduced, and that the farmers were very much discouraged, indeed, by finding a declining fertility of soil and a declining income from the direct sale of the grain product. At that time a number of pioneers—gentlemen who were interested in the welfare of the country in the different Provinces, and particularly the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec—found that it was necessary that some change should be made in the system of agriculture, so as to change that system from a deterioration from year to year to one that would add to the fertility of the soil and increase the products. The happy thought was struck that the dairy business, if introduced, would be the means of bringing about that desirable result. We have gone on slowly ever since. I shall now refer particularly to cheese-making, which is the leading industry and has been developed the greatest. Twenty-five years ago we were importing several hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of cheese for home consumption, and the dairy business was in a very small form. The dairies were very small indeed, and the number of cattle very few, and the amount of butter made was inferior. A change has been made, and we find that in the space of twenty-five years,

from importing several hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of cheese products each year, that we are to-day exporting the large amount of from \$8,000,000 to \$9,000,000 worth. The entire amount of the dairy, adding butter and cheese together, amounted to between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000. This represents a large amount of money, and represents the enormous progress that has been made in the dairy interest in a short space of time. Although this amount is very large indeed, yet it only represents in a very small degree the advantage which accrues from this improved system, this changed system of work. We find that in the leading dairy sections that land is increasing in value, and that from year to year the number of cattle is increasing and the resources of the land are increasing. When we come to consider that system which has changed from a deterioration of the soil to one that has increased the productive value of the soil from year to year we begin to appreciate this industry. We must admit the fact that when you increase the fertility of the soil you increase the value of it. The more fertile it is the more valuable it is. Measure that fact, that increase of fertility from year to year, in comparison with the direct money value, and I hold that the increased value of land has been fully more than the value of the products. Then add the value of the animals. We find that with an improved system of feeding we have an improved production—an improvement on all sides, and sources of great profit and value to this Dominion.

This is of sufficient importance to make it a national consideration, and every man within our boundaries should assist and encourage this trade, to make it a greater success in the future than in the past, because we all know this is an agricultural country. We know that we depend largely upon the products of the land for our success and for our prosperity, and we know that when we increase the prosperity of the farmers, when we increase the prosperity of the agriculturist we increase the prosperity of everyone in the country. This is a significant fact, which I have no doubt will be borne out by your judgment in the matter. The Provinces have done a great deal in assisting in the local development of this country. The Provinces have their associations. The different Governments of the Provinces have encouraged these local associations for the guidance and protection of dairymen in matters relating to the raising of the standard of the quality of the product, increasing the yield, favoring the means of feeding better, favoring the means of reducing the cost of production and favoring the means for increasing the value of that which is produced. Having done all this, a great deal of credit is due the Provinces for the very liberal advances they have made in this direction, and generally we have made such wonderful progress that the different civilized countries of the world to-day competing in the markets of the world are jealous of our prosperity, and they are now taking example from us in every way where they are competing in the markets of the world, thereby reducing the value of the cheese products. We find, to-day, the keenest competition, and it is by the collected intelligence of the different Provinces in their special work of dairying that they have been able to place these products in the markets of the world and compete with countries which are in many instances underselling us. The dairymen of this country are making rapid advances; but look at this matter fairly and squarely, and we will see that we will be behind in a very short time. The Dominion Government must come to the rescue. We must establish a Dominion association. We must have the support of the Federal Government, so that, by their special protection and guidance, we will be able to keep the leading position which we, in this Dominion, now hold in the markets of the world. As to the quality of the product which we are producing: we must not only maintain the quality but we must maintain the position in producing the product cheaply, so as to compete and make a profit by selling on the markets, and compete with the different countries of the world. The Provinces have done a great deal, but there is yet work to do which we find that the Provinces are not able to come up to or overtake. We find it necessary that the dairymen throughout the Dominion should come to the House of Commons and hold a meeting here to formulate some system whereby we can overtake this work which cannot be overtaken by Provinces.

Gentlemen, we had a very successful meeting in the House in your committee rooms yesterday, and we had the support and encouragement of many of the representative gentlemen of the Dominion, and in every case the sentiment was unanimous to encourage and support the agricultural interests of this country in that which has a tendency to increase the fertility of the soil and thereby increase the product to the farmer. It was the unanimous wish that an association, known as the Dominion Dairymen's Association, should be formed for the protection, and development of this great industry. It was, at that meeting, unanimously resolved that the delegates who meet you here to-day should present to you some of the requirements which now present themselves in the markets of the world. Gentlemen, we have met here, and we shall strive to lay before you our objects and our claims as dairymen; as practical farmers throughout this Dominion of ours, we were pleased to receive a very cordial invitation from Prof. Saunders of the Experimental Farm. We accepted that invitation and visited the Experimental Farm, which has lately been started in the centre here; and, sir, every man who visited that farm expressed surprise at the great development and great progress that is being made there. Taking the rough land and converting it into the richest, in a very short time they have made it into the finest arable soil; and, gentlemen, the effort which has been made is well worthy of the members who started it and worthy of every man within this Dominion. It shows, gentlemen, that you are taking an interest in this matter—in the agricultural welfare of the country; it shows that you are determined to establish a great future for the agriculturists of this country. We were very much encouraged by our visit to the Experimental Farm. We found that they were very successful in carrying on experimental work in agriculture. Gentlemen, we know that when we come to deal with the hidden laws of nature in connection with farming, with so many principles combined one within the other, it is only by employing the most skilled and scientific men that these hidden principles will be made known. Such men will guide the practical farmer to successful results. Gentlemen, we think that by the encouragement you have shown there you will give us assistance in maintaining this association, and assist us in carrying on this Dominion Dairymen's Association.

You will give a fair consideration and make representations to the Government, which you represent here, in support of the interests which we all have at stake, an interest which should be attended to, and assisted and encouraged in every way within your power. We hope that you will encourage this organization. We hope that you will assist us in carrying this interest forward by the collecting of the wisdom of the different Provinces. The wise men of the different Provinces will be collected here annually, and we will be able to discuss ideas, and exchange sentiments, and experiments, and results of observation that will be of great and lasting benefit to this grand Dominion of ours. By having this dairymen's association supported liberally by this Government we will be able to become an advisory board, not only to the Experimental Farm, not only to the practical dairymen of this country, but to the representative body of this country. We can lay before the representative body of this country some points for consideration, which will be of interest to you as representative men and of vital interest to us as practical men throughout this country. There is one fact that we must admit: that there are many things that farmers require. Many matters require attention which, from lack of organization, they have not been able to represent their case thus far. By an organization of this kind they can fairly and readily represent their interests to you as representative men, and by giving a fair and candid consideration to these matters of vital interest to these men and our country you will be better able to represent the people whom you represent here. I believe on this score you ought to give us a favorable consideration in the maintenance of this dairymen's association. We hope and expect to make this dairymen's association an incorporated body. By your assistance we hope to attain this. We also hope to meet here annually, so that it shall become a permanent dairymen's association for the Dominion. We have also decided unanimously that one of the leading requirements of to-day, to assist us to compete in the markets

of the world and increase the fertility of the soil, is to have some man specially adapted and qualified to take this matter up and give it his special attention. We find that there are specialists directing all productions, and before we can succeed in the markets of the world we must have men specially qualified for all purposes, and we ask you that a commissioner or director of dairying—a dairy commissioner—should be appointed for this Dominion of ours, who shall have as his special care and attention the development of this dairying interest. I do not think it is asking too much to ask for your support of this recommendation. The work of this commissioner would be in the direction of taking up matters, and questions, and material which the Provinces cannot take up to-day. It will cover the question of inspection of milk; and let me here say that we find in creameries and cheese factories throughout this country a great deal of fraud and wrong is being done in the supply of milk, to the injury of the manufacturers and the interests of this country.

We should have proper legislation to overtake this work in regard to the inspection of milk. When we look at the inspection of scales we find there is a Federal scale inspector going throughout the country inspecting every scale, so that no fraud should be perpetrated. If this is important to the factory it is just as important that we should look to the quality of the milk, and see that the milk weighed on these scales has not been watered, and has not had a portion of the cream removed. Then it is a great injustice to honest men that we should have sold in the market the product of adulterated milk to compete with those producing a good article from pure milk. Gentlemen, I think this matter will receive your approval. You will agree with us that the milk inspection should be under the control of a Federal commissioner, who should make this his special duty to remove this difficulty that we find in the practice. The work of this commissioner might also be, to consider matters in connection with railway transit, as well as ocean transit, with a view to bringing about a measure which would permit of the transit of our product in a better form. His work would also be to encourage a better market, and to assist in the disposal of goods on the market in a better form—I mean to say, that it would be the special duty of this commissioner to consider means and measures to improve the marketable condition of our cheese in whatever form it might appear. Gentlemen, there are a few considerations which suggest themselves, and I am happy to inform you that a number of gentlemen are here, prepared to set forth our views in other forms. I hope that you will give this matter your careful consideration, and recommend that these things be carried out, as suggested.

Prof. ROBERTSON (of Guelph).—Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I count it no small honor to stand before this committee and speak on behalf of this association, on the interests of this great dairying industry. Speaking as a delegate from the Province of Ontario, I have to say that we recognize, perhaps, the need of this association less than the other Provinces. We have had our provincial associations, which have done us such capital service, but we think now that the service we have realized by these provincial associations might be extended to the whole Dominion through this channel, and in that way this Association would do for the whole Dominion what our provincial associations have done for the farmers of our several Provinces. I would detain you a few moments recounting a few of the things that the dairying business has done for us. I will confine myself to a few heads, and say this: that the dairy industry of this whole Dominion increases the possible food supply per acre—that is, any man engaged in the dairying industry will provide more food per acre, and thus get more profit for himself, than he could by growing grain alone. It enables the farmers to sell the products of their work to more advantage. It demands then, I think, and deserves the attention of our public men in this respect.

It gives employment to a large population, and will give employment to a larger population; and whatever gives employment to a larger population you will see increases the whole value of the property of the country, because population is all that gives value to property. The dairy restores the energy to the exhausted soil.

In many counties of our Province it was impossible to grow wheat to advantage until dairying was introduced, and then exhausted fields were able to carry good crops. The same is true of other sections of the Dominion, and this association will seek to make possible for the Dominion what has been done for our counties. It will save the rich soil from being exhausted. In the North-West we are said to have such rich soil that it will never be exhausted. Still, if dairying were introduced there it would give larger crops for centuries to come. It enlarges the earning power per acre. When an acre of land has been given a larger earning power by this means it gives the farmer a better chance to sell his skill with his labor. It puts an additional market value into the fields of the Dominion—that is to say, when a cheese factory is established in any section a farm within three miles of that factory will sell for more than a farm twenty miles away; and thus, in our Province of Ontario we have a value stored up to the extent of \$50,000,000 in our fields. Then, it adds to the direct income of the farmers; because I think the man who keeps good dairy cattle can produce both butter and cheese, as well as beef, without lessening his income from grain. The dairy farmer will sell more grain, because of his rich fields. It claims in that way the support of those who wish their country well. It encourages co-operation among farmers. The cheese factories have done more to make farmers trust each other than anything else, because they learn there to co-operate and carry on their own business. Nothing has tended more to lessen the chances of fraud among farmers than the establishment of cheese factories. Men can discuss their business and learn their own affairs better. Then it gives scope, which is worth something, for the application of the highest order of intellect. I would not detain you here, but I would like to say this: some boys are getting to have the notion that farm work means only drudgery; but it is true that when a man raises stock he has a chance to put as much skill into the work as the man who carves a statue out of a block of marble. The sculptor, by his skill, can put life into the lips of marble; and the farmer can, by his skill, make an animal grow in the way his intellect says it should grow. Then it generates a love for agriculture, because it gives a boy a chance to make the most of himself, by calling into exercise all his powers. Farmers have neglected to make the most of their business, in that they have made their boys more working animals than thinking animals. A man on a dairy farm has to think first and work afterwards. Therefore, I would encourage dairying all over the Dominion. It must effectually consolidate the factions of this Dominion into one prosperous and progressive people. We will have a united work, and by an interchange of work the farmers of Quebec and Nova Scotia would think more of the farmers of Ontario, and *vice versa*. By this association we expect to promote that good end. Having said so much along that line, I have very little more to say. With all this valuable interest in dairy farming, our Province of Ontario did not recognize the possibilities of this business until we formed an association.

The whole thing languished until the dairymen's associations were formed, about twenty-one years ago, and since that time business has been gradually improved, and gradually making more money for the farmers. What the Province of Ontario has attained our Dominion should attain. When we have done that in Ontario we do not feel like standing aside and saying that we will not help this Dominion association to complete this growth. We think that this association can help the Provincial associations in their work. In that the Dominion Government will be doing itself justice, and the people of the country will be helped. These associations have been spending their time and money in this way, by disseminating information and collecting information from the several Provinces, and spreading information from Manitoba into Ontario and Ontario into Manitoba. By-and-bye Manitoba will be sending cheese and butter to China and Japan. Manitoba will teach us, and we will have the best markets in the whole Dominion, as well as the best methods. This association, as a means to do that, should receive the financial help requisite, and money spent in this way will be for the country's good. Then the association welds

our dairying efforts into co-operation. In the Province of Ontario 99 $\frac{1}{2}$ of the cheese made is made in the cheese factories; so we send from the Dominion of Canada quite one-third of all the cheese England buys abroad. Now, we make in the Province of Ontario less than 3 per cent. of our butter in the creameries, and we send to England not 99 per cent. of our butter, but less than 2 per cent. of the butter she buys. Consequently, we never have a great deal of English gold coming this way into Quebec, New Brunswick and Manitoba. This association is meant to do that—that is, if the money it gets is well used and well applied. Therefore, I say this association should do for the several Provinces what our Provincial associations have done for individual counties. In doing that it can also extend its influence beyond the provincial associations, by looking up markets abroad for the common product of our country. The usefulness would not be merely looking up markets, but disseminating information as to how to meet these markets by the best rates, by the best means of transportation, both in cars and steamboat accommodation, and to better these markets taken from us—our birthright—by Denmark, Sweden, Holland and Germany. The natural markets are ours, and we can occupy these markets if we make ourselves worthy of the occasion. There is also need for inspection of milk. I have all along contended, in my public and private work in this cause, that the Dominion Government should be the source of all efforts to put down the practice of fraud in regard to the foods of the people. You have indicated, as far as I know, a capital Bill for this purpose this year, but the Bill itself is of no service unless there is the machinery behind it to enforce it. After all a Bill on the Statute Book will never keep farmers from adulterating milk, unless some men go out and prevent them from doing it. They will be prevented from the moral fear that they will be put in a bad place.

I will not detain you long. I think from what I have said that I might urge it upon every member of Parliament, and especially upon the members of this committee, to advocate the dairy business in their several constituencies as the best means for making rich fields, a prosperous, contented and progressive people. If we had that it would make this Dominion what it deserves to be—the best place for men and women to live in, to make the most of life, by being well fed and clothed. If we continue to make it such we will get the best reward for our skill and labor as farmers that can be had in any part of the world. If we wish to make it so, we can only make it so by fostering and developing this dairy business, which it is the purpose of this dairy association to extend. I hope my hearing will not end at being listened to, but that you will give us a good deal of money, and I will be gratified that I have spoken.

MR. DERBYSHIRE.—The ground has been pretty well gone over, but I might say that the main point in which the Dominion Government can assist us is in taking hold of this matter of the adulteration of milk. The Provincial Government has not the power to pass this law. It was thought that the provincial law would be sufficient to cover this business, but it was found that it was *ultra vires* by the courts, and that we required this to be administered by the Dominion. We require a dairy commissioner for the Dominion, and he would have this specially under his charge. Now what do you think of the greatest industry of this Dominion? You go out to our Model Farm here—and it is a model farm in fact—and while they have done a great deal, it is found that we have not the largest industry represented there at all. We want a dairy commissioner, and a flag floating over his building, so that everyone will know that this is the important industry of this country, and the industry we calculate to foster in this country. We want that man to have full power to work this Act that you have passed this Session. We want this to be a great and lasting good to this Dominion. We want that head to be at this city of Ottawa, and that information flowing from this place, as the heart is the centre of the body and the blood flows from it to the extremities, the fingers and toes—will go all over the country. We desire that this dairy commissioner will be the centre for the development of this great industry. I think I need not take up more of your time, further than to impress upon you the necessity for this dairymen's association,

this Dominion association, for carrying on the work in such a way that the world will know we are carrying on this dairy business, and enable us to make a uniform article, and by which, if a farmer in Ontario is making \$60 per cow, they may know about it in Quebec. It should be the aim of every farmer to rise to the same standard.

Mr. BOBIEN.—After the details that have been so ably put before you by Prof. Robertson, I do not think that I need go into any further detail, only to impress on this committee—which really represents the agricultural interests, because you are the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Commons—that you are now called upon to protect the biggest interest, the biggest staple, that you have to legislate upon in the Dominion Parliament.

We talk of our lumber trade. See what the Government have done for the lumber trade! They have put slides everywhere, in order to facilitate the travelling of that staple from the wild forests to the market. Now, gentlemen, you represent the agricultural interests, and we are here to ask you to-day to facilitate the shipping of the biggest article produced by the greatest number of our farming population. After all, the farmers form the greatest bulk of our population. It is for the products of their fields that we are asking you to do us the favor of legislating upon, so that it may be brought up in the cheapest way to the market. We want you to protect this article, so that after it has been made good by the intelligence and work of the farmer you can keep it in the proper place, and you will not allow strangers—foreigners—to come in with an article which has not been so well manufactured, outside of our boundary line, and put the name on it “Canadian Produce,” and sell it before the article which has been produced in the Dominion of Canada. Now, this is the subject upon which you are called to legislate, Mr. Chairman; this is the protection we have the right to ask you to give us. We want you to give us a commissioner who will see that, when honesty has been put into our cheese and butter, somebody manufacturing outside of our limits won't come in and put an inferior article, which has not been manufactured honestly, on the market, and put upon it the honest name of “Canadian Produce.” Now, gentlemen, give us that protection. We want you to give us protection against ourselves. We want protection against ourselves, because we are not above temptation, any more than members of Parliament. Sometimes some of us will, seeing we have got a very prosperous and intelligent farmer alongside of us, who feeds his cattle well and sends rich milk to the factory, the man who is not working hard goes in, in an indirect way, and robs this honest man. He sends water to the factory, while his neighbor sends good milk with lots of cream. Now, we want you to protect our farming interest against that evil. We want an inspector, who will see, by his subordinate, that a man who sends water instead of milk shall get less money, and be punished besides. That is what we ask from you, gentlemen. You are the Committee on Agriculture, and from my experience in Parliament I must say that it is, sometimes, not the most active committee. I don't want to say that that is the case in this Parliament. Gentlemen, this is a staple article that we are manufacturing; and, as Prof. Robertson has said, it is not only the principal article that we manufacture on our farms, but really the one that is necessary to make farming successful and to make it remunerative. Gentlemen, after the beet industry was introduced into France it changed, in ten years, completely as to the mode of agriculture, and made it twice and four times as remunerative.

When the dairy industry is introduced into the country agriculture is benefited, because, as our Professor said a minute ago, you have to make the fields productive in order to feed the cattle, and you have to get a good breed in order that the cow will give you lots of butter. It may thus be said that it exercises beneficial influence upon the farm all round. The farmer's land becomes better, his intelligence is better and his pocket is better. That is what we want from you. I think this is the last place that we should make a speech, because that is in your department; but I thought I would simply put in a few remarks, in order to do my part of a duty.

Now, it remains for you to do your part, and I hope we will find, when this association is brought together next Session, we will have something to show you. Even at the end of a year we will show you results that will astonish you, that will astonish the whole public. When I listened, with a great deal of attention, to the remarks of practical men like our president, who is at the head of seventy-five or eighty factories, what did I hear? I heard from them that the export of cheese, instead of amounting to about \$9,000,000, you can in three or four years, if you give us the help, double it, and make it \$18,000,000. Now, that would be \$18,000,000, doubling the revenue of the farmers, doubling the results of all our farmers, making better farms and giving more money to every one of us. This is not the enunciation of a man who does not understand the whole thing, who has not studied the statistics. These are the principles supported by men who have been in the practice for years and years, and who tell you they know all about this subject. If you do this, at the end of three or four years you will double the exports of the Dominion. Is it not right that we should keep for the farmers that great market that belongs to us? I may be on the wrong side of the channel, but this is the country of my adoption, and I am proud of it. I said the same thing in France. Why should we send only 2 per cent. of the butter to England? Why should they go to Denmark instead of coming to Canada? Because we do not give to this matter the attention we should. We have no protection. I am a protectionist, and you do not give us protection for our dairy articles. We must have that protection, and the first I ask you for is for protection against ourselves. That is the first thing we want. You pay the police and we will do the work, and we will all be prosperous.

Prof. BARNARD.—We know that the Committee on Agriculture in the House has been, within four years, doing a most important work for the agriculturists of this country. I remember being called here a few years ago when the question arose as to having an Experimental Station. Great business tact and intelligence was brought to bear on these questions, and my friend will admit that the Committee on Agriculture at Ottawa, so far as we know, is doing good work. I merely mention this point, because I think it is a matter of justice. Now, we do not come here as beggars from the different Provinces, and say: "Gentlemen, we are unable to do our own work, and we want you to do it for us;" but the result of an organization here will be to force the different provincial bodies to do two and three times more than they thought necessary to do in the past, because one Province will try and take the lead over another Province, and each Province will desire to do its duty. Therefore, we do not come here merely to say, gentlemen, we cannot afford to do our Provincial work, but we come here to show you that there is a large proportion of intelligent work to be done by experimental work, of knowledge to be acquired, which once acquired will be useful for the whole Dominion of Canada. We want men in Canada to show us how to feed our cows within one-quarter of a cent per day lower than what we actually feed them to-day. Just calculate the number of cows in the Dominion, and you will see the profit every day. Gentlemen, it is not a matter of a-quarter of a cent, but you will find that it is a matter of several cents, and I merely gave that as an example. I would show you, if I had the time, that experiments made this winter have shown the dairymen of Quebec that we can produce dairy products as cheaply in winter, if we know how to go to work about it, as we can in the summer. Now, as I said before the committee last night, if we called the farmers—I merely speak of the intelligent farmers, I leave the others out—if we called a meeting of the intelligent farmers all over the Dominion, and told them that we were certain that milk can be produced just as cheaply in winter as in summer, the intelligent farmers of this Dominion would laugh at us; and yet it is a fact which cannot be contradicted. We have proof of it; and, therefore, gentlemen, the intelligent man up in this Province who will show us how to feed our stock a little cheaper and produce milk in great abundance will do not only a Provincial work, but a Federal work. Now, another question—I don't know whether it has been touched upon sufficiently—is the fact that in the foreign markets, with terrible

competition, the United States has been beaten by Canadian produce; but they do not intend to be beaten in the future. What is the result of our little credit in the London markets? The result is that \$15,000 of the Federal money in the States has been given to every State in the Union for experimental work, and this experimental work was mostly, nearly all—I may say, universally—asked for dairying purposes principally. Why? Because Canada in the London markets has taken a higher standing than American cheese. Well, gentlemen, it shows you the amount of labor we must now do if we wish to maintain our position. Although we are now doing remarkably well in cheese we have to compete with the United States, and they intend to beat us in the English markets, and in every market in the world. You must admit that we can fight in a hard fight. Why, you all know, gentlemen, that the value of butter imported into England is four or five times that of cheese. Where are we? It was stated that our export to England does not amount to 2 per cent. We do not export to England 2 per cent. of what the English people want of butter, and yet we have in a few years, not more than fifteen or twenty, obtained such a standing in that market from nothing at all, in respect to cheese, that we have come to export one-third of the whole consumption there.

If we make an effort we can make our butter as good as Danish—just as good, and perhaps a little better. The moment we make it good, the moment intelligence is brought to bear to put that butter in the shape the market requires it—not only the English market, but other foreign markets as well—we will see good results. I see that butter is now being carried from Denmark, coming by way of England to this country, taking the Canadian Pacific Railway and going over to the Pacific, taking the steamers there and going to Japan and China—butter from Denmark passing through Canada, and saying, "Gentlemen, you don't know how to make butter." Are we going to stand that? There is one more point: we have shown in Quebec that we are not much advanced in agriculture. I have been director of agriculture in that Province for several years. We have found where we could produce \$1 in dairy products we can produce \$5 additional, besides dairy products. Why? Because in Quebec, unfortunately, we grow the raw material and send it a long distance for sale. We exported the wealth of our farm and the capital of our farmers. The moment we began to introduce cows, that moment we found out they were not going to ruin the farm. That was the opinion fifteen years ago, that the farmer should not have more cows than would be sufficient to give milk for his family. We have proven that to be false, and wherever \$1 had been obtained by improvement in dairying we have \$5 additional. Our people are intelligent enough, when you have shown them that a dollar is certain, not to refuse to take it.

MAJOR BOLTON (Manitoba).—I have much pleasure in being present at this meeting, coming from the far West, as I do, and the reason of my being here is to attend at the formation of a dairying association for the whole of Canada. We are here to-day for the purpose of impressing upon the Government and Parliament of Canada the advantages and the necessity for such an association. We have the example before us in the various Provinces in the formation of such an association, and the necessity that they found among themselves for promoting the interests of dairying by the formation of these organizations. A great deal of good has been accomplished by them. We have two associations in the Province of Ontario, we have one in the Province of Quebec, and we have one formed in the Province of Manitoba. These associations meet annually and disseminate information in the various Provinces as to what will best promote the dairy interest. We can take a step further here, and form an association for the whole of Canada, so that we can come down from Manitoba and meet the friends from the extreme east, and find out what will best promote agriculture in the different parts of the country. That is the object of our association.

In the United States they have brought their associations to a very high degree of perfection, and they are supported by very large financial help in the United States, and they are fully alive to the necessity of taking the very best means they

have at their disposal in order to promote the dairying interests, As one of the members of our association yesterday told us, he was present in the State of New Jersey at one of their associations there, and the Governor had made his address, and he said to the meeting: "Gentlemen, what we want you to do is to beat Canada in the cheese market." This gentleman in question got up and told them that they could not beat Canada. Still it does not do to rest entirely upon the feeling of strength within ourselves, because we are subjected to the competition of the whole world, and the markets of the world are open to us. What we want to do is to draw to our country the larger portion of the wealth that is to be derived from that important industry, both dairying and butter-making. There is no doubt about it, another thing, so far as Dominion legislation is concerned, I think it would be a very good thing if there were cheap means of forming joint stock companies—that could be done through Dominion legislation. We have in our Provincial Legislatures a very simple method of forming joint stock companies, by a simple declaration; and bying that with the Minister of Agriculture, the company is formed. I think if the privilege could be extended to the Dominion Legislature as well as the Provincial Legislatures it would facilitate the formation of these companies. I know myself that there is a very great opening in the North-West and Manitoba for the formation of joint stock companies for the promotion of dairying. As has been stated here to-day by other gentlemen who have addressed you, we have developed a very large industry in our cheese, and we have attained a most enviable reputation in regard to this matter; but, on the other hand, we have not made the progress or established the reputation we should be able to do in the matter of butter. I do not think, myself, it would be advisable for us to turn aside for one moment from the manufacture of cheese, on which such a large amount of experience and such an enviable reputation has been obtained—that it would not be advisable to turn our attention to butter at a sacrifice to cheese; but at the same time we have an enormous territory to the west of us, and we have large districts where the development of the dairying interests has not taken place, as was done in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. We have out in the North-West Territories a very magnificent field for the development of our dairying interests and for the development of our butter interests—we have the land, we have the soil, we have the hay, we have the pasture. What we want to send in there is the capital and the cows—we want the capital and cows in there to build up creameries—we have all the feed necessary to support any number of cows you can send us, and the perfection to which creameries, cheese factories and dairying has been brought has reduced it to a simple matter. We can start a creamery just the same as we can start a cotton factory, or a tannery, or anything else. It is not as it used to be—the home made article—but we can bring together 500 or 600 cows, and the more you can bring together the cheaper you can make it. We can build a creamery and turn out a superior article, and export it to the markets of the world with as much ease as we can start a cotton factory or a tannery. Now, last year you all heard that we suffered from frost—we had magnificent crops in 1887, but the frost came on the 8th of August, 1888, and touched a great many of our fields, and reduced the crops exactly one-half. We read in the papers that you down here were suffering from drouth, and cows sold from \$8, \$10, \$12 and \$15 each, simply because the farmers had not the feed to winter them over, and wanted to realize, instead of overstocking the farms throughout the coming winter.

There was food of ours going to waste. Every field of wheat that suffered from the frost that nipped it on the 8th of August, just when it was in the blossom—it was only two degrees of frost that did it, but it killed the plant in the blossom—was so much food lost. After the berry is formed we can stand a great deal more frost, but it was the frost on the 8th and 16th of August that took our wheat in that way. It is quite possible for us to start the incorporation of joint stock companies for the development of an industry of that kind out in the Province of Manitoba. We have cheap land. You can go there and buy five or six thousand acres for a few dollars. The stock can be put on there. There is another thing in regard to it. Down here,

what you call "deacons" are disposed of and young calves killed in order that the full milk can be used in the dairy. I have no doubt that a great many of those calves would make excellent dairy cows. They come from good dairy stock and would make excellent dairy cows. A system might be devised by which these animals could be exported to Manitoba, and so much wealth be made to flow into that country. What we want out there is population and stock of all kinds. We will develop and assist in developing that country, so far as butter-making is concerned, and show that the country is quite capable of doing so. We live in that latitude where the highest quality of butter is produced, and we can develop a system by which we can draw from our cows a great deal more value than we do at the present time. We only take six months' milk from our cows. We ought to take nine or ten months, and we could do that with a proper system of winter dairying; but there are many ideas of this kind that we might learn from one another by being brought together in this association. I believe the most important association of this Dominion will be the Dominion association. It is the purpose of this association, if they can succeed in forming themselves and getting the necessary legislation to become incorporated, to meet here about the opening days of Parliament and have a session of three or four days, so that each representative might keep himself thoroughly posted in such an important interest. We are here for the purpose of asking your assistance to give a dairy commissioner, whose duties shall be to watch over the dairy interests of the country and to assist us in other ways. We have got to thank you very much for your kindness in allowing us to meet here in these rooms, and I will take back to the Province of Manitoba a very satisfactory feeling of the good results that are being accomplished through this association.

MR. CASSEWELL (Ingersoll).—I will not detain you long. It would be useless in me, after the exhaustive speeches that have been made, especially by Prof. Robertson, to speak at length. I think, however, I can give you a few facts that will cover the ground for the necessity of this Dominion association. We received an invitation from Mr. Lynch to meet here, and our association thought well to send six delegates, but I am sorry to say only two came. I am sorry Mr. Ballantyne is not here, but I am happy to say we have been able to place him on the board of directors. What I wish to impress particularly on the mind of the committee and the Government is this: that in the past there is nothing that has done so much good as the dairy industry of Canada. I have had the honor of being connected with the Ontario Association, as director, president or vice-president, since its inception, along with Mr. Ballantyne.

We have tried to do the best we could for the public interest, and we have tried to use the money given us to as good advantage as possible, so I do not think the Government of Ontario can look back and find where they have spent any money more judiciously than that given to the Dairymen's Association; and what I want principally to impress on this meeting is this: that we are at the head of the world as a cheese-producing country, and have the name of producing the best quality. Now, we have competitors who, if we do not take care and keep ourselves at the head, will take the place we have, and that we have taken from them. Some fear the United States; but we have other countries to fear more than the United States, especially Australia and New Zealand, who are devoting their attention to the produce of dairies, and last year it was the cause of lower prices being paid during the season, because there was expected to be a large amount, four times the export of what it was other years, but on account of the drouth it did not come, and it did not have the expected effect. Well, some few years ago the American product was excellent and the best goods sent to England. The circulars reported American cheese 2 to 4 shillings above Canadian cheese. About four or five years ago, through the efforts of the Dairymen's Association, all the intelligence that could be brought to bear on Canadian cheese was published in the circulars. Canadian cheese then took a start and headed the market. What did the Americans do? They appointed some of the principal dairymen of that country to go through our dairies.

I drove them around some myself, and two salesmen were present at our association meeting in London last year. They went around, and they found out what we were doing and the principal thing that they learned was that our dairymen always cried: "Don't skim; don't skim. Don't make skim cheese." They were making skim cheese and putting in other ingredients to cheapen the product and make a profit by destroying the quality. They went back and told the Americans and their representative men, and the representative men went to the Government, and the Government gave them money. They told them that they must appoint inspectors and see that the milk sent in was better. They did so, and last year they got \$70,000 from New York State alone, and they have \$10,000 to employ two special analysts for New York State alone, making \$80,000 in all. What is the result? I heard a large dealer say last fall, that instead of being able to come to Canada to get these goods they could get these goods where skim cheese was produced before. We know their interests and we know our own, and we must look at our materials and see that we do not lose the market we have to-day. We have to use pure milk. We have to continue the making of excellent cheese. We have Prof. Robertson and others who can tell us what to do; but we want an Act to punish the fraudulent and protect the honest one, and I am sorry to say there are too many of them not honest. Perhaps some of the farmers will not like what I say, but I say before the committee that there should be an Act to punish them, and inspectors should be appointed by the Dominion Government to see that there may be no failing, and, where guilty, to see that they shall be punished. This last year we spent \$3,200 on inspectors, in western Ontario, and it has resulted in a very large amount of good.

In the first place, many of the factories said: "We don't want inspectors;" but those who did not want them last year want them this year. Why? Because the good milk will go to the factory that has the inspector and the bad will go to those that haven't them. A gentleman here will tell you that when they had Mr. Macdonald, who was a volunteer inspector, visit their factory last year he found thirty-six adulterated and thirty-two pure. You would hardly think that possible in a respectable community. Next day, when they inspected the milk they were nearly all right. They expected the inspector. It is not the amount of good which may be done at the time, but it is the terror that keeps dishonest men from doing it. The man who sends watered milk not only robs the factory, but robs this country of its good name. It did me good yesterday to see the way that representative men took up the work. They seemed to be heart and soul in with the dairymen. I never was so much surprised as to see the intelligence and ability of these French gentlemen. They took hold of the matter in such a way as to show they have a power that we have not got, especially my friend Prof. Barnard. If anything is to be accomplished and this Dominion association carried on we need a little grease to keep the wheels going. We have seen the good results from the Ontario association through the grants given by the Ontario Government. I believe more good can be done by the Dominion Government. If Canada is to stand to the front, and if we are to be able to produce the best goods to send to England, we must have the right quality of milk. I am sorry to say that very much of it is not the best, and the reason is, you cannot make good cheese from rotten milk nor robbed milk. If you take away the cream you take away the essential oils that give that peculiar richness which marks our Canadian cheese; you also take away the weight. But there is no time to go into all these things. We want the law first to punish the offenders, and then we want the inspector appointed to carry it out. We want the means necessary to do these things. We do not want more than is necessary, but we want this man appointed, so that we will find out what is wanted. I believe if you give us a grant and give us your assistance we shall be able to appoint a man of prudence and judgment, a man of integrity, who will spend that money solely for the advancement of the dairy interest of Canada. I hope you will see in your judgment the necessity for a Dominion association, and help it along. When I first got word of it a few weeks ago, when Mr. Lynch first approached us with his letter, we said the delegates would

have to come too far; that there would be too much expense, and that the provincial associations were doing all that could be done. When I came down here, however, and met these gentlemen from the east, gentlemen like Prof. Barnard, I quite fell in with the idea, and I am proud to say that I am a director, and will do all I can to assist it. I hope it will be an institution that will be backed up by the Government, and I feel sure that next year, when they come before you, they will be able to show you that the money has been well spent.

The CHAIRMAN.—I would like to ask the president, what the extent of the assistance given by the Provincial Government is.

Mr. MACPHERSON.—I can only give you what is done in the Province of Ontario. This year we have the promise of \$6,500.

Prof. BARNARD.—Quebec has voted \$7,000 direct for dairy purposes, and we have to find a few dollars besides.

Major BOLTON.—In the Province of Manitoba we get \$1,000.

Mr. CASSWELL.—Last year we had \$11,000, and we found ourselves \$700 in debt. It takes a large amount of money to run this institution and keep inspectors on the road.

Mr. HESSON.—Are they constantly on the road?

Mr. CASSWELL.—No; they commence on the 1st of May and end the 1st of November. And then I think it would be wise to have a dairying school—a school of education, where young men can go and receive an intelligent education in dairy matters.